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Abstract

In 1999 a large building was discovered at Tel Kedesh that had been the administrative center for northern Upper Galilee in the Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid periods. The building had been partially destroyed and abandoned around 143 BCE, a date that corresponds remarkably well with 1 Maccabees’ account of the defeat of the Seleucid army by the Hasmonaeans (1 Maccabees 11:62-74). Approximately 5 years later it was repurposed for domestic use and inhabited by an otherwise unknown group of people (“the Squatters”) whose material culture was very different from both that of the Persian/Hellenistic Administrative Building (PHAB) and that of the Late Hellenistic Stuccoed Building, a villa at Tel Anafa, ca. 12 km northeast of Kedesh that was being built at the same time that the Squatters were living in the administrative building. Many of the Squatter vessels came from Lower Galilee and represent shapes that have parallels at Jerusalem, Shechem, Pella, Gamla, and Khirbet esh-Shuhara; they also suggest southern potting traditions. This dissertation explores the possibility that the Squatters at Tel Kedesh could have been Jews settled by Jonathan after his defeat of Demetrius II (or Galileans who migrated northward) within the context of academic debates over early Hasmonaean annexation of and Jewish expansion into Galilee (i.e., prior to 103 BCE). It uses the data from Kedesh to explore important questions about social changes brought about by the decline of Seleucid power and the consequent rise of autonomous “states” on the eve of Roman annexation of the Eastern Mediterranean. On a more theoretical level it raises questions about the degree to which we can equate material remains with actual cultures in history (“Do pots equal people?”), issues of identity in antiquity (individual, group, ethnic, religious, and cultural), and intercultural relations and economic transactions in border regions. In synthesizing the above analyses it concludes that the Squatters were most likely the dispossessed urban poor of the city of Kedesh and exposes the ubiquitous but previously unstudied phenomenon of people making homes in abandoned urban buildings in antiquity.
Chapter 1
Discoveries and Questions

“All archaeological inference about past societies (including, potentially, the identification of social groups and boundaries) hinges critically upon an understanding of the relationship between material and non-material aspects of culture and society: left with only remnants of the former, we seek to use them to perceive and comprehend the latter. That is the essence of the archaeological endeavor.” –Michael Dietler and Ingrid Herbich

“The aspects of things that are most important for us are hidden because of their simplicity and familiarity. (One is unable to notice something because it is always before one’s eyes.) The real foundations of his enquiry do not strike a man at all. Unless that fact has at some time struck him.—And this means: we fail to be struck by what, once seen, is most striking and most powerful.” –Ludwig Wittgenstein

In 144 or 143 BCE the Hasmonean Jewish army, led by the High Priest Jonathan, defeated the Seleucid army in the Plain of Hazor, some 20 km north of the Sea of Galilee. The event was recorded in the book of 1 Maccabees, our lone source for the actions of the Hasmonaeans in the period between 167 BCE and 135 BCE and generally regarded by scholars to be an official dynastic record composed by a court writer during the reign of John Hyrcanus I (134-104 BCE). It reads:

(Jonathan) passed through the country as far as Damascus. Then Jonathan heard that the officers of Demetrius had come to Kedesh in Galilee with a large army, intending to remove him from office [or

---


“intending to divert him from his mission”). He went to meet them, but left his brother Simon in the country… Jonathan and his army encamped by the waters of Gennesaret (i.e., the Sea of Galilee). Early in the morning they marched to the plain of Hazor, and there in the plain the army of the foreigners met him; they had set an ambush against him in the mountains, but they themselves met him face to face. Then the men in ambush emerged from their places and joined battle. All the men with Jonathan fled; not one of them was left except Mattathias son of Absalom and Judas son of Chalphi, commanders of the forces of the army. Jonathan tore his clothes, put dust on his head, and prayed. Then he turned back to the battle against the enemy and routed them, and they fled. When his men who were fleeing saw this, they returned to him and joined him in the pursuit as far as Kadesh, to [the Seleucid] camp, and there they encamped. As many as three thousand of the foreigners fell that day. And Jonathan returned to Jerusalem. (1 Maccabees 11:62-74) 

Given that many, if not most, scholars have understood the Hasmonaeans to have had expansionistic plans to return Israel to its biblical (i.e., God-given) borders – as indeed they nearly did in over the following fifty years, Jonathan’s immediate return to Jerusalem, 150 kilometers to the south, seems strange. One might suspect that Jonathan left a garrison behind, having (re-)established a Jewish foothold in the biblical land of Naphtali.

---


4 καὶ ἠξίωσαν οἱ ἀπὸ Γάζης Ἰωναθαὶ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δεξίας καὶ ἔλαβεν τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀρχιπρίτων αὐτῶν εἰς ὃμηρα καὶ ἐξεπέστειλεν αὐτοῖς εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ διήλθεν τὴν χώραν ἐως Δαμασκοῦ καὶ ἤκουσεν Ἰωναθαὶ ὅτι παρῆραν οἱ ἄρχοντες Δημητρίου εἰς Κηθὲς τὴν εἰς τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς βουλόμενοι μεταστήσαντο αὐτὸς τῆς χρείας καὶ συνήμησαν αὐτοῖς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Σιμώνα κατέληπεν εἰς τῇ χώρᾳ καὶ παρενέβαινεν Σιμώνος ἐπὶ Βαβύλωνα καὶ ἐπολέμησε αὐτὴν ἡμέρας πολλὰς καὶ συνέκλεισεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἠξίωσαν αὐτὸν τὸν δεξίας λαβείς καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔξεβαλεν αὐτοῖς ἔκειθεν καὶ κατελάβετο τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἔθετο ἐπ’ αὐτὴν φρούριον καὶ Ἰωναθαὶ καὶ ἡ παρεμβολὴ αὐτοῦ παρενέβαινεν ὕπ’ τοῦ ἱδροῦ τοῦ Γεννησαρ καὶ ὄρθρισαν τὸ πρῶς εἰς τὸ πεδίον Ἀσωρ καὶ ἤδω ἡ παρεμβολὴ ἀλλοφυλῶν ἀπῆρυν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πεδίον καὶ ἔξεβαλεν ἐξεδράν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ὑπάρχον αὐτοῦ δὲ ἐπηρεάσαν ἐξ ἐναντίας τὰς ἐξ ἐξεδράν ἐξανάστησαν ἐκ τῶν πολίων αὐτῶν καὶ συνήμησαν πόλεμον καὶ ἐξήγυγκαν οἱ παρὰ Ἰωναθαὶ πάντες οὐδὲ εἰς κατελείψῃ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν πλῆθος Μαθαθαῖος ὁ τοῦ Ἀφαλαμωῦ καὶ Ιουσᾶ ὁ τοῦ Χαλφᾶ ἄρχοντες τῆς στρατιάς τῶν δυνάμεως καὶ διέρρησεν Ἰωναθαὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπέθετο γῆν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ προσπήξατο ὑπεστρέψαντος αὐτοῦ πολέμω καὶ ἐπερώταντο αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔφυγεν καὶ ἐδύναντο τοὺς παρ’ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπέστρεψαν ἐπ’ αὐτῶν καὶ ἔδωκεν μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐως Κηθὲς ἐως τὴν παρεμβολὴν αὐτῶν καὶ παρενέβαινεν ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐπεσεν ἐκ τῶν ἀλλοφυλῶν εἰς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ εἰς ἄνδρας τρισχίλίους καὶ ἐπεστρέψαν Ἰωναθαὶ εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ. Cf. the parallel in Ant. 13.154 ff.
Discoveries and Problems: The Squatter Phase at Tel Kedesh

In 1999 a large administrative building was discovered at Tel Kedesh, an archaeological site located ca. 10 km northwest of Hazor and ca. 1 km southeast of the modern Israel/Lebanon border (33.110133°N/35.530943°E; New Israel Grid Coordinates 249997/779517 – see Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 4).\(^5\) The building was constructed around 500 BCE and its inhabitants appear to have been in charge of the administration of the region for the Persians, Ptolemies, and Seleucids, as is evidenced by the discovery of storerooms, a lavish dining area, an archive room with more than 2,200 bullae (one of which reads “governor over the land” in Phoenician), and a seal with iconography that has parallels in the Persepolis Fortification Archives.\(^6\) This use of the building ended with partial destruction that can be archaeologically dated to within a year or two of 143 BCE. There is every reason to think that the abandonment of this building and the end of its status as a locus of administrative hegemony was the result of Jonathan’s defeat of Demetrius and the gradual implosion of the Seleucid Empire.

Subsequent to the building’s abandonment it appears to have laid empty for a period of approximately 3-5 years, after which it was reinhabited and repurposed by an otherwise unknown group of squatters.\(^7\) They divided up the Persian/Hellenistic Administrative Building (PHAB) space by building walls that were inferior to those built

---


\(^7\) The word “squatter” is used here and elsewhere in this dissertation without the pejorative connotation that often accompanies it in modern contexts. It is defined as somebody having no formal or legal title to the land or building occupied by him or her. It has been capitalized in this work when used in reference to the particular squatters who inhabited the Administrative Building at Tel Kedesh.
during the PHAB phases (0.45-0.65 m wide, vs. the Administrative Building’s 0.80-1.0 m-wide walls, and not founded as deeply, not constructed with foundation trenches, and often neither vertically or horizontally straight). Their ceramic and non-ceramic assemblage included cooking pots, table ware, jewelry, loom weights, and spindlewhorls, and they built ovens (traditionally called “tabuns” in this part of the world) in the middle of corridors and otherwise repurposed space in such a way as to make it clear that what had been an administrative building was now the locus of domestic use (see Figure 9).

The most remarkable aspect of the Squatters’ material culture was their pottery, some of which was very different from that of both the chronologically earlier inhabitants of the PHAB and the chronologically similar inhabitants of the Late Hellenistic Stuccoed Building (LHSB) at Tel Anafa, a villa ca. 12 km northeast of Kedesh that was inhabited by wealthy Phoenicians (see Figure 1). Most of the forms and fabrics represented in the Squatter phases were not found in the earlier PHAB phases: at least 101 reconstructable vessels were recovered that are associated with the final, pre-abandonment phase of the PHAB (i.e., vessels that were left behind and/or destroyed in situ when the building was abandoned), among them are no vessels in Eastern Sigillata A (ESA), Basaltic Cooking Ware (BCW) or Tan Gray Marl (TGM), all pottery fabrics that are associated with the Squatters. Petrographic analysis has shown that the Basaltic Cooking Ware, which

---

9 Peter Stone, personal communication. See also Peter Stone, “'Provincial' Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context” (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 2012), especially chapter 5.
10 As will be discussed below, the reason for ESA not being represented in the PHAB is chronological, not material-cultural, as the PHAB was abandoned just before ESA began to be produced. The pottery that was produced from the same clay source as (but chronologically earlier than) ESA is called Black Slipped
comprised almost all of the Squatters’ cooking ware, originated in the Golan Heights or the Chorazin plateau in lower Galilee, ca. 20 km to the southeast.\textsuperscript{11} It has been found at Gamla in the Golan Heights (a Jewish site in this period), Karm er Ras in lower Galilee, and Khirbet esh-Shuhara, a site located ca. 8 km. southwest of Kedesh at which there are abandonment and rehabilitation phases similar in time to those in the administrative building at Kedesh (see Figure 1).\textsuperscript{12} It has not been found in any quantity at Tel Anafa or Dan, both of which are clearly non-Jewish sites located in the Huleh Valley, ca. 13 km and 19 km northeast of Kedesh, respectively, and with arguably the same access to the Golan Heights and Lower Galilee.\textsuperscript{13} On the other hand, the PHAB cooking ware has been petrographically identified as having been produced from clay sources located along the coast, probably in or near the predominantly Phoenician coastal cities of Tyre and Akko, 35 and 45 km to the west, respectively (as the crow flies; overland routes would have been longer).

The shapes of many of the Squatter vessels are also unlike those found in the pre-Squatter phases of the administrative building but have parallels in Jerusalem, Shechem, Pella, Gamla, and Khirbet esh-Shuhara. In fact, “all of the new forms and wares attested

\textsuperscript{11} Anastasia Shapiro, Andrea Berlin, and Peter Stone, "Tel Kedesh - Fabrics and Wares," (Unpublished Report).
\textsuperscript{12} See Stone, "Provincial' Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context."
\textsuperscript{13} Herbert, \textit{Tel Anafa I: Final Report on Ten Years of Excavation at a Hellenistic and Roman Settlement in Northern Israel}; Stone, "Provincial' Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context."
in quantity at Kedesh in [Squatter] loci find earlier parallels at sites inland and to the south, most notably Shechem and Jerusalem in the Central Hills.\textsuperscript{14} The only site north of the Sea of Galilee which has presented parallels for these new forms is Khirbet esh-Shuhara, which, as has just been noted, has a similar abandonment/reoccupation history as the Kedesh squatter phase. The fabric of some of these “southern shapes” also seems to betray southern potting traditions. Basaltic Cooking Ware has an abundance of calcite inclusions, which necessitate very specific techniques during the preparation of the clay and/or the firing of the vessels in order to keep them from being destroyed in the kiln. Calcite has thermal expansion coefficients similar to clay minerals, so a calcite temper can enhance the thermal shock resistance of the pot. However, it begins to decompose into CO\textsubscript{2} and CaO (which combines with H\textsubscript{2}O to form the significantly more volumous Ca(OH)\textsubscript{2}) at temperatures as low as 620° C, with the result that spalling and complete vessel failure tends to occur at temperatures above 700-750° C.\textsuperscript{15} This problem can be mitigated by firing in a reduced environment, by firing below 650° C or above 900° C, by docking (dunking pots in cold water after firing), or by adding salt to the the clay before

\textsuperscript{14} See the “Squatter Kedesh in a Regional Context” section of Chapter 5 in Stone, "Provincial Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context."

firing. Calcite had not been used in cooking vessels in the Galilee since the Iron Age or Persian period; it was, however, used as a temper in cooking vessels throughout the Hellenistic period at sites in the Central Hills. As Stone has suggested, the production of cooking vessels using a temper with specific qualities that were both beneficial for the function of vessels but which required specialized knowledge of firing properties to avoid destruction in the kiln suggests the movement of potters from the Central Hills to the Chorazim plateau and/or the dissemination of particular potting practices.

The Possibility of Hasmonaean Expansion into Galilee Prior to 104/3 BCE

The available information suggests that the Hasmonaeans defeated Demetrius, "conquered" the city of Kedesh (at least to the degree that it no longer housed the region’s administrative center), after which time people with new commercial ties to Lower Galilee, Samaria, and Judaea converted the administrative building into housing units and lived in it. Nearly all scholars have concluded that the Galilee was not annexed

---


by the Hasmonaeans until 104/3 BCE, based on one problematic sentence in Josephus (*Antiquities* 13.318-319); is it possible that the Hasmonaeans expanded into Upper Galilee 40 years earlier? Both Galilees (Upper and Lower) and the Golan experienced an explosion of settlement activity in the mid-2rd century BCE, and although this has not been explicitly identified to be the result of Hasmonean expansion, a few scholars have suggested that the Hasmoneans annexed part of (presumably Lower) Galilee as early as 152 BCE on the basis of a letter in which Demetrius I promised Jonathan that he would not collect tribute from “the three districts added to Judaea from Samaria and Galilee.”

Numismatic evidence from 132-130 BCE includes “a rather surprising number of bronze coins of Antiochus VII from the mint of Jerusalem [that] have been found in Galilee.”

The fortress of Qeren Naftali, located 3.5 km southeast of Tel Kedesh in Upper Galilee,

---


20 1 Maccabees 10:25-42 – that date of ca. 152 BCE is based on 1 Macc 10:1-2 For an in-depth study of this letter, see Chapter 3.

21 Danny Syon, "Numismatic Evidence of Jewish Presence in Galilee before the Hasmonean Annexation?," *INR* 1 (1996), 21-24. Twelve coins of this uncommon type have been found at various sites in Galilee (Gush Halava/Gischala [1], Gamla/Gamala [4], Yodefat/Iotapata [2], Shihin/Asochis [1], Arbel/Arbela [1], Bet She’an/Nysa-Scythopolis [2], and Tel Basul near Bet She’an [1]), as compared to at least 55 in Judaea. Part of the argument centers around the common agreement among numismatists that bronze coins do not travel far from their mints and were not normally accepted as currency in all places. The suggestion is that these coins showed up in these cities as the result of pilgrimage to the Jerusalem Temple.
has been interpreted by its excavator to have been “part of the defense system of Hasmonaean Galilee,” though perhaps not until the reign of John Hyrcanus I (134-104 BCE). Finally, Josephus reported that John Hyrcanus I banished his son, the future Hasmonaean leader Alexander Jannaeus, to the Galilee sometime around 125 BCE (Antiquities 13.320-322), which some have claimed is evidence for the existence of Jewish urban centers in the region in that period. Perhaps the suggestion that the Squatters are evidence of Jewish presence at Kedesh around 140 BCE is not so far-fetched after all.

**Material and Immaterial Aspects of Society**

The Squatters’ material remains seem to indicate that they were either new, different people settling at Kedesh – their material remains were new and different from those of the PHAB – or that they were local people reusing the abandoned administrative building after a battle that drastically changed trade routes in the region. Even if the Squatters were not official, “state-sponsored” Hasmonaean settlers (see Chapter 3, below), the nature of the archaeological evidence demands that we take seriously the possibility that the sudden appearance of Lower Galilean ceramic forms and fabrics with the Squatters is evidence of a new ethnicity or society at Kedesh, especially in the face of evidence that Basaltic Cooking Ware and Tan Gray Marl vessels do not appear at nearby Phoenician sites like Tel Anafa and Dan (see Figure 1). Lower Galilee and the Central Hill region were inhabited, to one degree or another, by Jews, a people group that has traditionally been understood to have enforced ethnic boundaries more strictly than other people groups.

---

However, the history of archaeological inquiry has shown that the task of connecting archaeological remains with social and ethnic groups is more difficult than it might seem. The question at the heart of most, if not all archaeological inquiry is that of the relationship between material culture and historical society. Indeed, even this most common of academic phrases used to describe the things that we find in the dirt during the course of an archaeological excavation – “material culture” – betrays its modern raison d’être. Material culture, after all, is a social phenomenon: it was created within a culture, and the choices that went into its creation were conditioned by that culture. We ought to be able to “get back to” that culture through the material that its people left behind. Such attempts to say something about a historical society from its archaeological remains go back at least as far as V. Gordon Childe, who used the word “culture” to describe archaeological units that were demarcated on the basis of the regional distribution of associated stylistic similarities of material.\(^{23}\) This made sense within the conceptual framework that Childe was working, as he was trying to categorize groups of material in order to compare them to one another. But the assumption of a one-to-one relationship between material and social cultures was picked up and exploited in other fields. Within the field of Syro-Palestinian archaeology, the “Biblical Archaeology” of the 19th and early 20th centuries gave rise, in whole or in part, to archaeologists attempting to find material evidence for people and events recorded in the literary (i.e., biblical) sources. So the collared rim storage jars that were first excavated in Iron I strata in the central hill region of Israel, where the Bible says that the Israelites settled, became

---

the “Israelite” pottery,\textsuperscript{24} and the bichrome ware that was found at sites situated along the coast was understood to be the sign of Philistine presence on the basis of biblical evidence that identified those towns and cities as Philistine.\textsuperscript{25}

This sort of one-to-one identification between pots and people was ultimately rejected amongst anthropological archaeologists, largely as a result of the work of anthropological archaeologists like Binford in the 1960s and the rise of processual archaeology. Their methodological conclusions influenced biblical archaeology as well, but a continuing desire on the part of archaeologists to be able to say something about the social significance of material culture dictated that the assumption that archaeological remains can be “read” for ethnic and cultural information persisted, as can be seen in the logical contortions that biblical archaeologists often exhibited. For instance, Dothan was forced to conclude that the city of Beth Shemesh had an Israelite population but was under Philistine economic and political control in the 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE because the biblical sources said that the city was Israelite but archaeologists found a large quantity of stratified “Philistine pottery.” Some of the more recent studies have represented responsible attempts to explore the boundaries of what we can say about this connection,\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{24} There are many examples, but see, e.g., William Foxwell Albright, "Excavations and Results at Tell el-Ful (Gibeah of Saul)," \textit{AASOR} 4 (1922-1923), iii-160. On p. i he writes, “The importance of our study largely lies in the fact that it is here possible to date Israelite and Jewish ceramic types definitely, thus eliminating much of the indefiniteness which has hitherto prevented the archaeologist from evaluating his finds from a historical point of view” (my emphasis). In his discussion of Clark and Macalister’s publication of over forty vases from tombs at Tell el-Ful, he writes, “Macalister reached the conclusion, from which no archaeologist would dissent, that this pottery was all Israelite and Jewish…” Though he is careful to distinguish between “Hebrew” and “Israelite” occupation (the former being “a gradual, unorganized movement into the country, which continued for some three or four hundred years before the Israelite conquest” – see p. 44, n. 2), it is a foregone conclusion that ethnic groups can be easily discerned in the material record.

\textsuperscript{25} See, e.g, Trude Dothan’s comment: “Fortunately for us, the material culture of the Philistines is represented by a combination of archaeological and historical evidence that make ethnic identification almost certain. In our discussion of the sites we will…above all…emphasize the pottery, which is the hallmark and chief indicator of Philistine culture.” See Trude Krakauer Dothan, \textit{The Philistines and Their Material Culture} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 25. Thanks to Steve Werlin for pointing me to both of these references.
while others have simply replicated the traditional and biblical archaeological approaches while expressing them in the thinly veiled and often ambiguous language of trade patterns, cultural influence, or “food pathways.” For example, a type of pottery called Galilean Coarse Ware (GCW) has been identified as a marker of non-Jewish presence in the southern Levant to such a degree that the presence of GCW at a site that has otherwise been interpreted to have been Jewish has been grounds for identifying two phases – one “pagan” and the other “Jewish.”26 Another type of pottery found at sites in the Golan Heights that were assumed to be Ituraean was initially called “Golan Ware” and later changed to the more ethnicity-indicating “Ituraean Ware.” The result has created a situation in which the presence of this type of pottery is often interpreted as evidence of Ituraean presence (or, alternatively, confirmation of the assumption that a particular site was an Ituraean town or village).27 The ethnic appellation in “Phoenician.

26 There are many examples; one will suffice here: “The possible connection between the cult objects from these two sites and the GCW suggests that the GCW could be an identifying feature of pagan residences in the Galilee (mainly Upper Galilee), and that the abandonment of these sites corresponds to the Hasmonaean conquest [which was religiously motivated, as “it is obvious that the Hasmonaean kings aspired to conquer the Galilee” because “their goal was to rule an empire as large as the kingdom of David and Solomon”]. Aviam, Jews, Pagans, and Christians in the Galilee: 25 Years of Archaeological Excavations and Surveys: Hellenistic to Byzantine periods, 44, 48. See also Frankel et al., Settlement Dynamics and Regional Diversity in Ancient Upper Galilee: Archaeological Survey of Upper Galilee. A further related problem is the identification of GCW, as Stone has noted: “The fabric described as Galilean coarseware actually appears to consist of several distinct but related fabrics distributed only in the Upper Galilee.” Stone, “Provincial Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context.” Chapter 5, n. 10. He notes there a forthcoming article by Frankel and Berlin: Andrea Berlin and Rafi Frankel, “The Sanctuary at Mizpe Yammim: Phoenician Cult and Territory in the Upper Galilee During the Persian Period,” BASOR (Forthcoming). With respect to GCW, see, for instance, the example of Qeren Naftali: Aviam, Jews, Pagans, and Christians in the Galilee: 25 Years of Archaeological Excavations and Surveys: Hellenistic to Byzantine periods, 59-88. In all fairness, it must be noted that Aviam’s conclusion is not based entirely on the pottery: his designation of a stepped pool as a miqveh in Room 1 of Square D (pp. 69-70), as well as his interpretation of Josephus’ accounts of the exploits of Aristobulus I and John Hyrcanus, contribute to his overall phasing of the site, and vice-versa. But the logic seems to be largely circular and GCW is explicitly discussed as evidence for non-Jewish occupation of sites prior to Jewish conquest on p. 63.

27 See, e.g., Shimon Dar, Settlements and Cult Sites on Mount Hermon, Israel: Ituraean Culture in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods. BAR International Series (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1993); Shimon Dar, History of the Hermon: Sites of the Ituraeans (Hebrew; Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz Ha-Meukhad, 1994). E. Myers has written a somewhat scathing critique of Dar’s approach and conclusions. Though she is overly deconstructionistic in her approach and does not delve very deeply into the archaeological evidence, she is
Semi-Fine” represents more responsible in that it indicates the Phoenician source, and not the find spots, of the pottery. However, in at least some cases the mapping of its find spots has been described as “Phoenician market routes,” which have then been assumed to represent ethnic boundaries, presumably the result of an assumption that Phoenician market routes would delineate themselves along Phoenician ethnic lines (Phoenicians would only trade with Phoenicians; Phoenician wares would not cross ethnic boundaries) and/or that Jews would have enforced a presumed ideal of little or no interaction with non-Jews (and, perhaps, especially Hellenized non-Jews). The language used makes the conclusion more palatable than the outright statement of the equation that (Phoenician


29 Andrea Berlin, "From Monarchy to Markets: The Phoenicians in Hellenistic Palestine," BASOR 306 (1997), 75-88; Berlin, "Archaeological Sources for the History of Palestine. Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period." The argument is less that Phoenicians only bought pottery from Phoenicians (or that Phoenicians only sold pottery to Phoenicians, though that is explicitly implied in “From Monarchy to Markets”) than it is the assumption that Jews kept to themselves, presumably as a result of conceptions of “separatedness” and “purity.” The conclusion is tacitly assumed rather than explicitly argued, and comes out in statements such as “…the material culture and lifestyle of the Jewish central hills did not wash quickly over the land” (my emphasis – the unqualified connection is between material culture, society [including religion, when the statement is read in context], physical location, and cultural influence), as well as in the continual identification of Eastern Sigillata A and Phoenician Semi-Fine as hallmarks of non-Jewish settlements (or, when they are found in Jewish settlements, as evidence of the “Hellenization” of those settlements, often with a sense of Jews becoming “less Jewish” in a religious sense). See Berlin, "Archaeological Sources for the History of Palestine. Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period," throughout, but especially pp. 23, 29, 30, 36, 39, 40, 43, and the inset box on p. 24. The connection between Phoenician Semi-Fine and Phoenician populations is more explicit in “From Monarchy to Markets,” in which one finds statements such as “It is reasonable to suppose that [Phoenician vendors] journeying to [the Hula Valley in Upper Galilee], as probably everywhere else that their wares occur, was in response to the demands of the many Phoenicians living in the area” (p. 85, my emphasis). She goes on to cite a “provocative” 1989 theory by M. Stevenson as evidence that “the decidedly ‘Phoenician’ character of the Hula Valley settlements’ Hellenistic-period material culture [i.e., the presence of Phoenician Semi-Fine] may further document the social phenomenon of ‘identity-conscious social groups’… [which are defined as] peoples who perceive themselves as sharing important common characteristics distinct from their immediate neighbors.” She does not give any evidence of such a perception on the part of the Phoenicians and there is no further discussion of this or other theories of culture. In the end, there is good reason to reject such interpretations of pottery as “signaling” ethnic identity and borders (see below). See Berlin, "From Monarchy to Markets: The Phoenicians in Hellenistic Palestine." throughout, but especially pp. 84-85
Semi-Fine = evidence for Phoenician people and culture), but the conclusion is nonetheless the same.

Another way that scholars have attempted to connect ancient societies to their material remains has been through the study of “style” (i.e., decoration) on pottery as evidence of different cultures. The failure of this approach to produce reliable results with respect to the movement and interaction of ancient people groups has led some scholars in the field of classical archaeology to instead study the form (i.e., the function) of vessels, and to identify function with cultural or ethnic groups on the premise that different cultures had different cuisines and styles of food preparation and consumption. So, for instance, Andrea Zifferero has suggested a link between “domestic pottery, food systems, and ethnicity,” and Jordi Principal has argued for dietary (and therefore cultural, though this word is never explicitly defined) changes being expressed in ceramic forms.  

However, while some of these investigations into the link(s) between form, function, and culture show promise, many fall victim to the complexities involved in discerning meaningful differences in form, the possibility that one form can have many functions (including ones which its creator did not envision or intend), and the reality that correlation does not indicate causation. So, for instance, Paul Arthur’s correlation between cookpots collocated with a preponderance of pig bones on the one hand, and casseroles collocated with a preponderance of sheep/goat bones on the other, might argue for the identification of culture groups by their pottery, as well as an ability to differentiate between locals and foreigners in the material record, but it does not

necessarily.\textsuperscript{31} Questions of how form relates to function and whether ceramic form can be usefully and reliably used to indicate different people groups, however, are not useful for our analysis of the Squatters at Tel Kedesh because there is no indication that the tiny differences in form were functionally meaningful. (It is one thing to argue for a functional difference in form between a cookpot and a casserole; it is quite another to argue for a functional difference between a cookpot with a 5 cm.-high neck and one with a 10 cm.-high neck. This issue is discussed more fully at the end of this chapter in the text associated with footnote 64.) As a result (and as will be discussed further below), the Squatters’ pottery represents a situation in which the differences in form and fabric might be a meaningful indication of a new ethnic group had moved into the building, but it need not necessarily. It could indicate, for instance, that a new economic group or social sub-group within the larger ethnic group represented by the PHAB occupants had moved into the building. No conclusions can be reached on the basis of the pottery alone.

**Society, Culture, and Material Culture**

However, recent anthropological and classical archaeological explorations of theories of identity and socio-cultural borders in human societies have yielded an exploitable link between ancient societies and their material culture that is helpful for our investigation of the Squatters.\textsuperscript{32} In so doing they have shown that critical questions such


\textsuperscript{32} Chief among the classical archaeologists (see below for the anthropologists who advocate for theoretical approaches to ethnicity in the interpretation of archaeological evidence) are probably Siân Jones and Jonathan Hall: Siân Jones, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present* (London; New York: Routledge, 1997); Siân Jones, "Identities in Practice: Towards an Archaeological Perspective on Jewish Identity in Antiquity," in *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period*, ed. Siân Jones and Sarah Pearce. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
as “What is culture?” and “What is ethnicity?” are not being asked by archaeologists (let alone answered), and that what Wittgenstein observed about epistemology (above, p. 1) is also true of the fields of ancient history and archaeology. The terms, concepts, and people groups that are most familiar to us and, more importantly, the conceptual frameworks within which we conduct our scholarly investigations, are the locale of many of the questions that we tend to neglect: “[That which should be] the real foundations of his inquiry do not strike a man at all. Unless that fact has at some time struck him.” These scholars have further shown that identity (whether individual, group, ethnic, or cultural) is dynamic and constantly renegotiated, not bounded by socio-political limits,\(^3\) and therefore that any archaeological interpretation that seeks to say something about ancient culture and cultural interactions must first understand “culture.”

There is no doubt that material culture and the societies that produce and consume it are linked; the questions are \textit{How?} and \textit{To what degree?} Any discussion of society, culture, or ethnicity must begin with a definition of these words,\(^4\) and any definition must find its foundation in the theoretical concept of groups, for all of these entities are, at their core, social groups. Social groups of all kinds form identities when (and as) individuals internalize shared group norms and values and segregate themselves (or segregate others from them) by establishing criteria of membership to determine

\(^3\)So also Jones: “Ethnic groups are not neatly packaged, territorially bounded, culture-bearing units in the present, nor are they likely to have been in the past.” See Jones, \textit{The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present}, 104.

\(^4\)So also Siân Jones, who has pointed out that one of the problems that plagues the modern study of ancient ethnicities is that these terms too often go undefined in the literature. See Jones, \textit{The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present}, xiii, 29.
inclusion and exclusion. This process is the result of daily interpersonal and intercultural negotiations, as well as the interpretation of written and unwritten traditions. It is what Bourdieu called *habitus*: the structures, dispositions, and actions of the group influence those of each individual within the group, and vice-versa, and they generate patterns of human action that appear to be operating as though the result of rules, but which in fact operate without rules. In Bourdieu’s words, the dispositions (i.e., the ways that people learn to act within the context of a group or society; the manifestation of the society or group in a person) are both “structured structures” and “structuring structures.”

Ethnic groups are a particular kind of social group that claim common kinship and blood lines, as well as (in most cases) some conception of a shared history and homeland. But ethnic groups’ purported biological criteria of membership, as well as the perceived homogeneity that goes along with it, are in fact as much of a social construct as the bounding criteria of any other social group. Although ethnic boundaries are circumscribed in language of consanguineous exclusionary criteria, people who

---

35 Hall defines a social group as the “internalization by the individual of shared group norms and values… [It] exists alongside a ‘personal identity’…” See Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, 30. He continues, “In day-to-day interaction it is going to be a question of one’s personal identity that is brought to bear. When, however, the identity of the group is threatened, a response on the individual level is mobilized because the identity of the ethnic group has been internalized by the individual, with the consequence that injury to the group is seen as an injury to the self.” See also Jones, "Identities in Practice: Towards an Archaeological Perspective on Jewish Identity in Antiquity,” in *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period*, 38.

36 Bourdieu defined *habitus* as “systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles of the generation and structuring of practices and representations which can be objectively ‘regulated’ and ‘regular’ without in any way being the product of obedience to rules…” (original emphasis). See Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology 16 (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 72.


38 This is to say that ethnic groups differ from most other social groups in that they define themselves primarily with respect to the same group in the past, and so a length time over which the group exists is important for its definition.
should be excluded on these grounds are regularly allowed into the group for a variety of socio-cultural reasons, such as intermarriage, adoption (legal or informal), and friendship. The perseverance of ethnic groups is never (and, over long periods of time, cannot be) maintained by permanent exclusion or by preventing boundary crossing. Indeed, it is in the act of crossing boundaries that the boundaries are affirmed. And when the boundaries are crossed, exclusionary criteria must be revised or, more often, reinterpreted. The fact that ethnic groups persist over long periods of time despite the permeability of their boundaries demonstrates just how effective these adaptation strategies can be, and this constant renegotiation of the defining criteria of exclusion or inclusion means that “maintenance” of group identity is actually the perpetual reconstruction of group identity.

Archaeologists look for patterns in the material culture of ancient social groups in order to get at what Dietler and Herbich call techniques – the human actions that resulted in the production, consumption, and utilization of those objects. These actions are important because they are expressions of conscious and unconscious choices made by individuals within an ancient society, and as such those choices can convey information about how that society was composed, how individuals and groups within it interacted

---

40. Hall: “Ethnic identity is a cultural construct, perpetually renewed and renegotiated through discourse and social praxis”; Satlow: “A community’s ‘Judaism’ is not made by a collection of texts or norms but by historically and socially situated human beings who engage, filter, and activate their traditions according to their local understandings”; Jones: “Ethnicity involves the subjective construction of identity on the basis of real or assumed shared culture and/or common descent…” See Hall, Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity, 19; Michael L. Satlow, “Defining Judaism: Accounting for ‘Religions’ in the Study of Religion,” JAAR 74, no. 4 (2006), 837-860: 846; Jones, “Identities in Practice: Towards an Archaeological Perspective on Jewish Identity in Antiquity,” in Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period, 37.
41. This term comes from the French tradition of technologie or ethnologie des techniques, which pays close attention to the process of making choices at all stages of the chaîne opératoire of production (essentially, the technical sequence of operations that result in the production of an object). See Dietler and Herbich, Habitus, Techniques, Style: An Integrated Approach to the Social Understanding of Material Culture and Boundaries,” in The Archaeology of Social Boundaries, 235 and endnotes 232 and 233.
with one another, and how the society interacted with other societies. But *techniques* cannot be understood as instantaneous action (although they usually are). Choices and actions are, like culture, conditioned by the *habitus*, and consequently they are created through a temporally extended process that Dietler and Herbich have termed the *chaîne opératoire* (essentially, the technical sequence of operations that result in the production or consumption of an object). In other words, although it is true that the material cultural patterns that we find in the archaeological record are the result of purposeful, socially contextualized human actions, to put it into these terms is to oversimplify the issue. It is not the case that a society’s culture is *simply* reflected in an individual’s actions (and, therefore, that material culture is equivalent to society) because the crucial link between a society and its individuals’ actions is choice conditioned by *habitus*. People in antiquity *made choices that led to actions* that produced and consumed objects. Put in terms of Bourdieu, Dietler, and Herbich, the production, use, and disposal of objects is the result of many actors, conditioned by one or more *habitus*, making many choices for different reasons. There *is a connection between ancient societies and their material culture, and it is to be found in technique* (i.e., actions that are the result of choices), when understood as a part of the *chaîne opératoire*.

The *habitus* is manifested in material culture through choices made during the production process. These choices produce either a conscious, active expression of the *habitus* – the category of “style,” which includes those aspects of material culture that are not attributable to either the technology or the function of the object, or an unconscious, passive reflection of the *habitus* – the category of “form,” which includes those aspects of material culture that *are* attributable to either the technology or the function of the
Both require that the material culture be “read” and interpreted (i.e., that meaningful information be extracted from it) in order for it to have communicated information about the person, people, or society that produced or consumed it. In the case of the Squatters, the aspects of material culture that are particular to them, when compared with the previous inhabitants of the PHAB, are BCW cooking pots and Tan Gray Marl utility vessels, which are distinctive in their technology and their form, but not their style. As a result, and as noted above, the problems of associating style with particular social groups are not important for our purposes. (We will, however, return to the question of form).

The process of making choices in the procurement and use of material culture is little different from that involved in producing it. It is possible for choices made by consumers to bring about changes in the product, and therefore in material cultural patterns (e.g., in a case in which one culture is producing something to meet the tastes and/or needs of another culture, or the way that market demands – shaped by *habitus* – force changes in market supply), but this will not always be the case, and even when it is, it does not necessitate a change in the producing culture’s *habitus*. More often, the consumer’s *habitus* (when it is different from the producer’s *habitus*) conditions the choices that actors make in the consumption of material culture. So the question to be asked is *Why might people consume certain kinds of material culture and not others?* Why might the Squatters have chosen to use BCW cooking pots instead of Sandy cooking ware, Gritty cooking ware, or Spatter Painted Ware (as the inhabitants of the Late Hellenistic Stuccoed Building at Tel Anafa did)? There are four possibilities: (1)

---

personal or group demands (e.g., aesthetics, religious prohibitions, etc); (2) function; (3) market routes and trade networks (choices being made about interaction with producers or marketers before choices are being made about what to consume. This is different than the question of availability, which is covered in option 4); and (4) economic and market variables like economic class, cost, advertisement, availability, etc. In the first three instances the habitus conditions the choice. In the last instance habitus plus necessity conditions choice.

We now find ourselves at the crux of the problem: in order to be able to say anything about an ancient society through its material culture, we must interpret the material culture in such a way as to understand the choices that informed technique because the production and consumption of objects (the chaîne opératoire) can occur in a variety of ways for a variety of reasons. For instance, the interpretation of a stepped, plastered pool as a miqveh (a ritual bath known from Jewish texts to be associated with theological purity concerns and used for ritual cleansing) is often problematic, and debates over their interpretation and their status as a marker for the presence of Jews in the material record have not infrequently erupted in scholarly literature precisely because we cannot assume motive on the part of ancient users of objects, even when we know something about the habitus.43 Scholars can point to Rabbinic legal requirements that a miqveh hold 40 seahs of water, that the water be “living water” (מיאים וינא) supplied in a

way such that it is not drawn by hand, etc., and on that basis argue that a particular plastered pool found at a particular archaeological site is a *miqveh*. But what of those *miqva’ot* that were not built to the specifications that were codified in the Mishnah, or water reservoirs that were built according to such specifications but that were not used as *miqva’ot*? It is not just a theoretical question, because the identification of a *miqveh* at an archaeological site means not just Jewish presence, but the presence of Jews who were concerned with ritual purity, which suggests that their religious, legal, cultural, ethnic, and economic ties correspond to those expressed by certain authors whose works we possess today. Put simply, the identification of one stepped, plastered installation as a *miqveh* speaks volumes about the culture and society of the people who lived in that town or city.

To translate this discussion into terms of pottery, we can classify and categorize differences in the ceramic record of a given site or region, but how can we determine which differences were culturally significant and which were not? How might we know if a change in a certain form, production method, or style of pottery is indicative of a choice that was meaningful within the producing or the consuming cultures? When dealing with the material remains of a historical society (i.e., a society for which we have a historical account, or from which we have the writings of an author or authors), we can try to understand the *habitus* that has conditioned the *chaîne opératoire*, and from it to understand the choices that were made. But any text provides only a snapshot of the culture taken by a particular individual (who is a member of many social groups) at a

---

44 See m. Miqva’ot.
particular time in history. Each one of these snapshots in and of itself preserves only a tiny bit of information about the culture in which it was composed, and so we are left to create a whole picture out of a patchwork of bits. When we study “the Jews” in 164 BCE Judaea (however we define the word “Jews”), we rarely acknowledge that they are not only a different group from the actual Jews that lived in 164 BCE Judaea (even if they are similar), but also that they are different from “the Jews” of 1 BCE Judaea or those of 164 BCE Galilee. Of course the paucity of evidence for life in antiquity is such that modern scholarship is unable to provide the nuance and resolution that is commensurate with the reality of life in the ancient world, and we must do what we can with what we have (a point to which I will turn shortly). But the lack of nuance in the history of research of these groups has also perpetuated the problem of describing ethnic groups in terms that do not recognize the fact that they are metaphors for (or schematics of) the actual human societies that they represent. In the specific case of the Galilee and the people living in it the situation is complicated further by the fact that extant texts related to Hellenistic and Roman Galilee were nearly all written by elites for elite audiences and are, with the exception of the large portion of the corpus that is represented by Josephus, disproportionately theological in content. As a result, when scholars conclude that “Jews” lived in Lower Galilee in the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods, the definition of that term cannot help but be overly developed with respect to elite and theological concerns (not to mention under representative of aspects of culture that were not important for the authors’ purposes). Put differently, the constructed societies of

---

45 So also Jones: “A particular group’s identity is unlikely to be monolithic or homogenous, and the same is true for the cultural beliefs and practices which inform that identity.” See Jones, “Identities in Practice: Towards an Archaeological Perspective on Jewish Identity in Antiquity,” in Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period, 39.
historical and archaeological discourse are “second order categories” and the reality of
the social practice behind them are “first order realities.”

This intractable problem is new neither to archaeologists nor historians. But it
means that archaeologists are, by definition, interpreting the remains of first order
categories via isomorphic, temporally static second order categories when they attempt to
create a link between ancient cultures and their physical remains. As a result, to the
degree that those second order categories have not accounted for the complexities and
fluidities of social and cultural identities or the contextual negotiation of borders (and I
am arguing here that modern scholarship has done a poor job of this, especially with
regard to the Jews), the interpretation of archaeological remains will remain simplistic
and reductionistic. This is not to say that nothing can be learned from texts and applied
to material culture, only that it requires both a caution and the discipline to correct for the
problems inherent in recreating ancient societies from texts, and that it is unlikely that it
will come easily or produce “some handy simple formula of ready utility to
archaeologists.”

46 Jones, applying Bourdieu’s conclusions to questions of ethnicity and archaeology, has come to the same
conclusion: “In reconstructing past ethnic groups, historians and archaeologists have colluded in giving
precedence to literary representations of ethnicity and searching for an isomorphic reflection of such
categories in the archaeological record. Yet to do so, I suggest, is to make the mistake of conflating
qualitatively different manifestations of ethnicity. … The point that I wish to emphasize here is the
importance of recognizing the qualitative difference between objectified, inscriptive, representations of
ethnicity [i.e., those that are recorded in historical sources] and the praxis of ethnicity.” See Jones,
“Identities in Practice: Towards an Archaeological Perspective on Jewish Identity in Antiquity,” in Jewish
Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period, 46-47.
47 This has been put well by Dietler and Herbich: “Where culture is viewed simply as a reflection, or an
effect, of uniformly shared cognitive structure rather than as an historical social process, there is little scope
within such an essentially static perspective for understanding change in either [material culture] or
society.” See Dietler and Herbich, "Habitus, Techniques, Style: An Integrated Approach to the Social
Understanding of Material Culture and Boundaries," in The Archaeology of Social Boundaries, 239.
48 Dietler and Herbich, "Habitus, Techniques, Style: An Integrated Approach to the Social Understanding
of Material Culture and Boundaries," in The Archaeology of Social Boundaries, 234.
In the specific case of the Tel Kedesh Squatters, we have two avenues that we might pursue. One is to investigate the possibility that they were Lower Galilean Jews, in which case we can attempt to say something about the *habitus* that informed their choices based on what we know of Lower Galilean Jews. The other is to start from a less teleological position and treat them as a generic, ahistorical social group. In this case the situation is even more problematic, for the material record is unlikely to provide any solid conclusions in and of itself, and we must be content with the reality that material culture cannot answer all of our questions. It must be supplemented with other information, one option for which is to turn to responsible ethnoarchaeological approaches in order to understand the range of factors that influence choices made in the production and consumption of pots.

The Luo people of western Kenya provide one such example. They live in an area of approximately 10,000 km$^2$ and are surrounded by peoples of different linguistic groups. They are divided by lineage into several “tribes” and “sub-tribes” that are traditional land-holding units and have strong territorial affiliations. But aspects of identity are not confined to issues of territorial, tribal, sub-tribal, or familial identification: for instance, the Luo do not practice circumcision, while the neighboring Luyia do.

The Luo potters, all of whom are women who live on their husbands’ patrilineal homestead, make 13 different types of vessel (excluding two that they produce exclusively for a neighboring people group and a series of recently developed imitations

---

of European forms that are produced by a few communities).\textsuperscript{50} The vast majority of pots are sold by the women themselves at local periodic markets, and over 90% of the pots sold to primary customers remain within 15 km. of the market (which makes sense given that most of them are carried to and from markets by foot).\textsuperscript{51} Though all Luo pottery can be grouped into 13 vessel types, any one region within Luo territory only uses between 9 and 11 of the forms, and people in all regions seem to use whatever pottery they consume for a roughly identical set of functions. In addition, there are only two types of vessel that are represented throughout the Luo area, and those types are not unique to the Luo.

Indeed, no forms are made both by all Luo potter communities and exclusively by Luo potters: the only two forms which are made by all Luo potter communities are also made by Luyia potters. Furthermore, variations on a common type have been found to be the result of different local conceptual traditions, as opposed to being variations on a common ideal type. “There is no global Luo «emic» classification that corresponds to our analytical set of 13 form categories, but rather a number of local classification schemes which we have chosen to aggregate this way.”\textsuperscript{52}

Dietler and Herbich’s study of the Luo also found that choices made in the consumption of pottery was both a socially complex phenomenon and not affected by social borders (whether ethnic, tribal, or linguistic). When micro-styles (i.e., different

\textsuperscript{50} “Types of vessel” here means “a range of shapes produced [that] can be divided for analytical purposes into a polythetic sets of…different abstract form categories.” The production of pottery is not a potter’s livelihood among the Luo. They have the same agricultural and domestic responsibilities as other Luo women, and the sale of their pottery supplies only a small subsidiary income. They are taught how to make pottery by their mothers-in-law and they are found on homesteads that are clustered around a clay source. There are usually several potters per homestead. In total these potters constitute only 1% of the female Luo population.

\textsuperscript{51} Dietler and Herbich came to this figure after tracking the location of 1,104 pots. Traders sometimes buy pots in bulk and transport them to further distances for resale at other markets and/or homesteads, thus increasing the distance of those pots from market, but those pots were not included in the 90%.

characteristic combinations of decorative, formal, and technical traits that allow one to clearly distinguish the products of different pottery communities) were mapped, they were fairly uniform in all directions, cutting across important ethnic and/or sub-tribal boundaries, whether between the Luo and their Bantu-speaking neighbors or various Luo sub-tribes. Furthermore, at markets on the Luo/Luyia border, where potters of both ethnic groups sold vessels of quite distinctive styles, no preference was demonstrated by consumers for the pots produced by potters of their own group. In other words, when the pots’ final destinations were mapped, the resulting picture was not of ethnic or cultural boundaries, but of a market catchment area, regardless of market location:

The borders of territories and groups which are clearly important to people are not reflected in the distribution of ceramic styles; and the boundaries of the style zones fall in areas which are of no cultural or social significance... Consequently, it must be admitted that for archaeologists neither the spatial distribution of ceramic styles nor regional resemblances in pot forms are necessarily very good indicators of ethnic identity. Homogenous style zones may pass across traditionally hostile borders, and the boundaries of these style zones may bisect groups with a strong sense of mutual identity.

If social boundaries have little or no effect on the distribution of consumed pots in a system in which pots are transported on women’s heads to and from market, resulting in nearly all of the pots moving less than 15 km., how much more will this be the case for large-scale trade in wares over hundreds or thousands of kilometers? The vessels have no role in the maintenance of group boundaries, and there are no messages encoded in the

---

53 Dietler and Herbich point out that regular armed conflict and invasion and defense of territory have occurred both between Luo sub-tribes and between the Luo and the Luyia over the past few centuries. These acts of aggression were only halted (with difficulty) by the colonial government at the beginning of the 20th century, but arguments about territorial boundaries have continued in the courts since then. Furthermore, both the Luo and Luyia has a rich stock of negative ethnic stereotypes that they apply to the other.

styles that serve as symbols of ethnic, sub-tribal or other group identity. This is not to say that the people groups who lived in Hellenistic Galilee necessarily behaved like the Luo, but rather that any argument that ethnic, tribal, or other social boundaries have an impact on patterns of consumption must bring both evidence for it and reason that the habitus governed the actors to act that way. Dietler and Herbich’s study of the Luo also highlights just how complex human societies are – a fact that is rarely, if ever, acknowledged by archaeologists and historians of antiquity.

**A Brief Excursus on the Special Case of Jews and Judaism**

The conclusion that ethnic or social boundaries do not necessarily constrain human interaction (and therefore trade) might seem obvious. However, the assumption that the Jews of antiquity were different from all other people groups as a result of conceptions of religious purity has long insinuated itself into the interpretation of archaeological remains in Israel/Palestine. This situation is the result, in large part, of the phenomenon that I described above: the texts from which we have recreated ancient “Judaism” are predominantly concerned with religious and theological issues as a result of the continued survival of the Jewish and Christian religions.55 This conception is sometimes expressed in terms of the Jewish religion being a defining criterion of ethnicity, and the existence of the religious category “Judaism” (or “Samaritanism,” or “Christianity”) alongside an absence of categories such as “Phoenicianism,” “Ituraeanism,” and “Syrianity” only serves to underscore the point: we think of Jews in antiquity very differently than we think of other people groups, in large part due to the fact that these are ancient people groups that gave us two of the religions of the modern

55 For a quick survey of the definition of this word as it changed over centuries see Satlow, "Defining Judaism: Accounting for 'Religions' in the Study of Religion," 838-842.
Religion undoubtedly played a role in ancient Jewish identity, as religion played a role in every individual’s and group’s identity in antiquity. However, we tend to put much greater emphasis on the role of religion for the Jews than for any other people group, again as a result of (a) the survival of the religion and the practice of the religion among modern scholars who study aspects of ancient Judaism, (b) the survival of so much literature about the religion, and (c) the overwhelming focus within that literature on theology. What is even meant by “the Jewish religion”? The “religion of the Bible”? The “religion of the Temple authorities”? The “religion of the people”? Which texts or artifacts should we prefer in order to answer this question, and how do we know if our interpretation of them is representative of an ancient definition? Traditionally the great amount of Rabbinic literature and the obvious fact that there was some connection between the Jewish religion of the Rabbis and that of the Second Temple period has meant that Second Temple Judaism has been interpreted in light of the Rabbinic texts.

We find *miqva’ot* and stone vessels in Second Temple Jerusalem and read about *miqva’ot* and stone vessels in the Rabbinic texts; therefore Second Temple Judaism must have

---

56 The Greek word translated into English as “Judaism” (Ἰουδαϊσµος) is unknown in ancient literature before the writing of 2 Maccabees in the late 2nd century BCE. See 2 Macc. 2:21-22; 4:11-13; 8:1; and 14:38. Cohen has argued that this is evidence that the concept of “Judaism” was in place by this time, while Mason has argued against this view. See Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 31 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Steve Mason, “Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History,” *JSJ* 38 (2007), 457-512. Satlow, accepting at least parts of Boyarin’s argument that Christianity brought about the concept of a religion as a category separate from ethnicity (a concept that was ultimately rejected by the rabbis) argues that, “Only in the Middle Ages do we find the penetration of the concept of ‘Judaism’ into Hebrew. One of the first, perhaps even the first, attestation of the Hebrew term for Judaism, *yahadut*, appears in Abraham Abulafia’s *Book of the Testimony*.” See Satlow, “Defining Judaism: Accounting for 'Religions' in the Study of Religion,” 840. Cf. Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004). The point here is that “Judaism” is indeed anachronistic when speaking of Phoenicians, Nabateans, and Syrians, yet that is precisely how it is normally used in modern scholarship and one of the reasons that we have such a difficult time properly categorizing and conceptualizing Jews in antiquity.
been concerned with purity in the same way that the authors and compilers of the Rabbinic texts were.

There is, however, a more problematic issue: modern scholarship on ancient Jews and Judaism has tended to assume the presence of a monolithic orthodoxy (e.g., “Second Temple Judaism”) and tacitly concluded that any departure from this orthodoxy was in some sense deviant from a “norm.” This is a different assumption of monolithicness than that discussed above; this is the assumption of cultural homogeneity among Jews that is the result of centuries of assumption of religious orthodoxy. The majority of scholarship over the last 150 years has emphasized or explicitly defined “Judaism” as the Yahwistic, Jerusalem Temple-centered religion of Judaea, and to then create an ethnicity and culture out of that religion, to the degree that E.P. Sanders changed the face of the study of Judaism as recently as the 1980s (with the results being applied well into the late 1990s or early 2000s) by arguing for a variety of “Second Temple Judaism.” His argument was based primarily on the fact that we find a variety of theological and religious viewpoints in the extant literature. The underlying presuppositions that Sanders was both assuming and critiquing were that of a monolithic (religious) orthodoxy, as well as a relative inability in the modern age to think of “Judaism” as something other than a religion.

However, not only is the assumption that Jewish religion was more or less equivalent to Jewish culture and ethnicity problematic, there is no good reason to assume

---

57 An assumption present in such conclusions is that extant texts, when properly interpreted by modern methods, will provide us with an emic definition of “Judaism” from which we can determine the degree to which other texts and communities were different (usually with at least a nuance of deviance).

that religious orthodoxy (let alone cultural orthodoxy) was a concept in the Second Temple period. "Orthodoxy" and "heresy" are concepts that were created by the later religions of Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism, and the requirements for orthodoxy are significant: there must be a person or group with the power to define and enforce that which is orthodox; there must be a motive and a payoff for the group in power to enforce that which is orthodox; there must be a means of communicating that decision to all who are to be affected by it; there must be a method and infrastructure that allows the enforcement of the definitions of orthodoxy and heresy; and there must be a communication network that allows "orthodoxy" to be continuously monitored and standardized.

Most importantly, the typical unstated presupposition that Judaism in antiquity was a monolithic orthodoxy forces the study of ancient Judaism to assume that if there were Jews in Hellenistic Galilee then they can only have defined their “Jewishness” in accordance with or opposition to the “Judaism of the Bible,” the “Judaism of the

---


60 The communication requirement alone was a heavy burden in the ancient world: in the Roman period (in which most regions had better roads than in the Hellenistic or Persian period), travel by land was no faster than 15-25 miles per day (faster by sea at probably 2-6 knots, and with a more direct route to the destination, but also more unpredictable), making the distance between Pisidian Antioch and Ephesus to be 13 days, between Rome and Syria to be between five and ten weeks, and between Jerusalem and Galilee to be at least 4 days. See Tacitus, *Annales* 6.50; Josephus, *Antiquities* 18:122-124 for an account of the 5-week trip of the announcement that Tiberius had died; as well as Cicero, *Epistulae ad familiares* 12.10.2 and *ad Att.* 14.9.3 for his account of ships taking 50 and over 100 days to reach Rome from Syria.
Temple,” or some other modern academic construct. Once any nuance of normality becomes attached to a category of ancient culture, religion, or way of life, all variants are, by definition, nuanced as somehow abnormal. Such a perspective precludes the possibility that people in Hellenistic Galilee negotiated their identities within the immediate historical, cultural, and geographical contexts in which they lived, which is how we understand all ancient people groups except Jews and Christians. Given all of the variables discussed above, it simply does not make sense to conceptualize ancient Jews as having been culturally and economically isolated from non-Jews around them. Indeed, there are dozens, if not hundreds, of textual sources that provide just such “exceptions to the rule.” Nevertheless, this presupposition continues to exert influence in academic thought about the Jews.

One final point: one of the problems inherent in the tacit scholarly consensus that there was some semblance of “Jewish orthodoxy” from which all other forms of Judaism deviated is that it gives “Judaism” agency. Judaism is a system, and it is not the system that acts or is acted on, but the individuals that are a part of the system. "‘Judaism’ does not have agency – Jews do.”61

The Squatters and Choices of Consumption

Let us return to the proposition of four realms in which choices might be made by consumers in an actual ancient society and apply them to the Squatters. The most important changing variable between the material culture of the PHAB occupants and that of the Squatters is to be found in the cooking pots, in which case aesthetics will not

---

have been a factor. However, if we begin with the assumption that the Squatters were Jews, then perhaps we would assume that they made decisions to interact with certain salesmen, either for reasons of purity (not with regard to only using a specific type of cooking pot, but with regard to only interacting with certain types of people) or because they were a very closed and segregated society and so only knew Jewish marketers (perhaps analogous to certain modern ultra-orthodox groups). But this would not make any sense at all. For starters, there is absolutely no evidence that Jews were such a closed society, especially outside the borders of Judaea. Josephus and 1 Maccabees consistently represented Jews in the Galilee, the Decapolis, the coastal cities, and Syria as living with non-Jews. Furthermore, all of the Squatter coins are from coastal mints, including the 26 bronze coins of Antiochus VII, the Jerusalem issues of which have been suggested to be evidence of Jewish presence and economic interaction with Jerusalem. They were clearly interacting with coastal markets to one degree or another. In addition, no miqva’ot or stone vessels have been found at Kedesh, and although the faunal profile of the Squatters is incomplete, all of the Squatter loci contained pig bones.

Another option is that of an unknown non-Kedesh-affiliated social group who moved into the abandoned building at Kedesh, bringing their “foreign” pottery with them, and who then maintained their trade connections once there (i.e., continued to bring “foreign” pottery into Kedesh). Such people could also be “Galileans” – whether Jews or not – moving north from Galilee or left by Jonathan in the wake of Demetrius’ defeat, or

---

62 See also the discussion of the cultural landscape of the Galilee in the Early Roman period in Chapter 2.
63 Syon, “Numismatic Evidence of Jewish Presence in Galilee before the Hasmonean Annexation?.” Twelve coins of this uncommon type have been found at various sites in Galilee (Gush Halava/Gischala, Gamla/Gamala, Yodefat/Iotapata, Shihin/Asochis, Arbel/Arbela, Bet She’an/Nysa-Scythopolis, and Tel Basul near Bet She’an), as compared to at least 55 in Judaea. Part of the argument centers around the common agreement among numismatists that bronze coins do not travel far from their mints and were not normally accepted as currency in all places. The suggestion is that these coins showed up in these cities as the result of pilgrimage to the Jerusalem Temple.
another people group altogether. Such a hypothesis would require one of two scenarios. Either the town of Kedesh was completely destroyed and all of its inhabitants run off or enslaved by Jonathan (i.e., the Squatters moved into an abandoned city for which there were no existing trade relations), or the Squatters were a people group that moved with such a unique culinary culture such that they bought certain vessels because those vessels allowed them to cook the kinds of food that they ate (i.e., vessel form = vessel function). Josephus knew Kedesh to be a Tyrian city in his day, so the first scenario would require the Seleucid-era (Tyrian) city to have been entirely depopulated, reinhabited by another people group who, at some point in the subsequent decades, abandoned the city, after which the city was again reinhabited by Tyrians. Such massive shifts over the course of 250 years are, perhaps, not entirely impossible, but it does seem a little fantastic to imagine that they would have occurred without some some mention of it in 1 Maccabees (which is not shy about portraying the Hasmonaeans as destroying cities) or Josephus. Instead, Kedesh is consistently portrayed as a Tyrian city in all of the extant sources. The second possibility would require the form of the high-necked cooking pots to have a function that would not be served by short-necked cooking pots, which is also unlikely. This theory has been advanced for the Frankish crusaders in Corinth in the 14th century CE,64 but it hinges entirely on an unfounded argument that the high neck collected so much exiting steam that it changed the water content of the food being cooked in it to such a degree that its users found folded neck cookpots to be unusable. Not only do I find that argument to be implausible, but Squatter cookpots tend to have high splayed necks, not high inturned necks, as the high-necked cook pots from 14th century Corinth did, and

so the shift in form does not suggest a shift in function. The only option that is left is that the shifts in material culture are due to economic and/or market variables, a possibility that I will turn to in Chapter 5. In the meantime, Jonathan’s presence at Kedesh and the lack of good information about Hasmonaean presence in Galilee prior to 104/3 BCE necessitate a closer look at the literary sources. First, however, we need a geopolitical framework within which to work.
Chapter 2
The Cultural and Political Landscape of Hellenistic Galilee and the Surrounding Regions

Other than a few way-stations along roads, Galilee was virtually uninhabited from the eighth to the second century B.C.E., when Jews repopulated it.¹

The resettlement of the Galilean region began gradually prior to the Persian period [ca. 600 BCE]...²

The population density during the Persian period [ca. 600-323 BCE] was similar to the last years of the Israelite period before the onslaught of the Assyrians in the 720s BCE.³

Nevertheless,…as descendants of Israelites, the Galileans would have found 'the laws of the Judaeans' different from their own indigenous customs and traditions … [T]hey had undergone more than eight centuries of separate development.⁴

…only a very few Galileans would have been descendants of the northern Israelites or descendants of any gentiles who had lived alongside them.⁵

The quotes above highlight the fact that there is very little scholarly consensus about the population and ethnic makeup of Galilee in the era prior to Palestine’s


annexation to Rome in 64/3 BCE. This is due in part to an almost complete lack of historical sources, as those that were deemed unimportant to Judaism or Christianity were not well preserved in the following centuries, and Galilee was, from this perspective, insignificant between the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 722 BCE and the Hasmonean expansion into the region. Conversely, Galilee’s status as the stage of Jesus’ ministry and the home of many of the Rabbis made it a focal point for Christians and Jews from Late Antiquity onward, resulting in the preservation of texts written about Galilee in the years between 70 and 200 CE to the exclusion of others. Today those texts constitute the vast majority of extant information about Galilee in all periods. This situation has further contributed to a phenomenon in which the vast majority of modern scholarly inquiry into ancient Galilee has been for the purpose of giving a social context to Jesus and the Rabbis.

The late 1st century CE Judaean historian Josephus described the Galilee as consisting of two parts. Lower Galilee was the region between the villages of Xaloth in the south and Bersabe in the north, and was bounded on the west by the territory of Ptolemais and Carmel, and on the east by the Jordan River, Hippene, Gadaris, and Gaulanitis on the east. Upper Galilee ran from Bersabe in the south to Baca in the north (which, he noted, was at the edge of Tyrian territory), and from Meroth on the west to Thella on the east (which was a village near the Jordan river – note that here he is referring to that part of the Jordan which flowed from Lake Hula to the Sea of Galilee). The modern equivalence between the cardinal direction north and the word “up” would have made little sense in ancient times, and it is most likely that “Upper Galilee” was not

---

6 The region might have received its name from the Hebrew כִּים, meaning “circle,” as a reference to its topographical encirclement by more mountainous terrain.

7 War 3.35ff.
understood as “Northern Galilee” but as “Galilee of higher elevation” in antiquity. Josephus’ dividing line between the two Galilees falls in the Beit HaKerem Valley and the Ammud stream to its east, north of which is a significant increase in elevation. This border and this understanding of Upper and Lower can also be found in the Mishnah, which locates Kfar Hananyah (which is in the Beit HaKerem Valley, next to Bersabe) on the border between Lower and Upper Galilee and notes that Upper Galilee is the region where sycamore trees do not grow. Although the precise location of its borders may have shifted slightly (especially in the north), the Galilee seems to have been conceived of and treated as a geographical entity throughout history, as it is today.

Josephus also lays out the surrounding regions in specific terms, and the boundaries are again notably topographical. To the south of the Galilee is the region of Samaria, which starts at the village of Ginea (perhaps modern Jenin), where the Jezreel valley begins to climb southward into the central hill that runs south past Jerusalem to the Negev Desert. Samaria is bounded on the south by Judaea, and while the eastern and western boundaries are not mentioned by Josephus, it is likely that the eastern and western boundaries of Judaea and the Galilee provide the answer: Samaria was probably bounded on the east by the Jordan river (as both the Galilee and Judaea were), and on the

---

8 It is worth noting that the modern Israeli Highway 85 – which, like ancient roads, was built along a path of least topographical resistance – runs through the Beit haKerem valley and closely approximates this dividing line between Upper and Lower Galilee. Anyone who has driven along Highway 85 will have noted the “lowlands” to the south and the steeply climbing mountains immediately to the north.

9 See m. Shev. 9:2; t. Shev. 7:6.

10 Modern Jenin is widely accepted as the location of Ginea, in part because the modern Arabic pronunciation of “Jenin” is etymologically connected to the Hebrew Bible’s Ein Ganim, and the book of Judith’s “Gini.” This connection was first identified by the 14th century physician and topographer Isaac Ben Moses, who wrote under the pen name Ishtori HaParchi. See אפרים מייסרה אינן וודא אלמלוע, ספר כפולה. אפרים מייסרה אינן וודא אלמלוע (ראה: ספר כפולה). At any rate, it is clear from Josephus that he considered (a) the Jezreel Valley (“the great plain”) to be part of Lower Galilee, and (b) the region of Samaria to start at the southern edge of the Jezreel and run southward.

11 Though note that at War 3.39 Josephus defines the southern border of the Galilee as being at Xaloth (modern Iksal), on the northern edge of the Jezreel. The Mishnah puts it at Kfar Otnay (modern Lejjun) – see m. Git. 7.7.
west either by the Mediterranean or by the region of one or more of the cities in the coastal plain – perhaps Apollonia and Caesarea Maritima (just as the coastal city of Ptolemais bounded the Galilee and the coastal city of Joppa bounded Judaea). To the east of Galilee and Samaria was the region of the Decapolis, which has historically been understood to have been settled by Greek soldiers and to have had predominantly non-Jewish populations.

**Galilee in the Iron Age**

Josephus’ 30 books about the Jewish revolt against Rome and the history of the Jewish people make it clear that the majority of the population of the Galilee in the late 1st century CE was Jewish. However, demographic details about the people who lived in this region during the Hellenistic period are completely missing. Nearly all scholars have founded their conclusions about this period on evidence from Annals 18 and 24 of the *Annals* of the Assyrian king Tiglath-Pileser III and books of the Hebrew Bible that were written in the 8th–7th centuries BCE. Prior to 734 BCE, when Tiglath Pileser III invaded the region, Galilee was part of the (northern) Israelite kingdom of Israel, which, according to common if disputed scholarly consensus, had split from the (southern) Israelite kingdom of Judah in the 10th century BCE. *Annals* 18 and 24, which are extremely fragmentary, record the number of people deported from Galilee in and after 734 BCE, which, if scholars’ readings are correct, totaled 13,520 (see Table 1). Scholarly estimates of the total population from which this 13,520 should be subtracted

---

12 Though the texts are fragmentary, *Annal* 18 gives the numbers 625, 650, and 656 as the number of people taken from what are presumably Galilean cities, while lines 9'–10' of *Annal* 24 read “13,250 [people…] with their belongings [I carried off to Assyria].” See Table 1.
have ranged from 17,600 (for the urban population of the Galilee), in which case 77% of the urban population was deported, to 93,750 (for all of Galilee), in which case only 14% of the population was deported.

The vast difference between these two numbers and their importance for understanding the ethnic, religious, and demographic makeup of the Galilee in the Hellenistic period requires belaboring the point for a moment. The first number was arrived at based on an assumption of 40 people per dunam (a number chosen because it is the midpoint of Broshi and Gophna’s suggestions of 30-50 people per dunam) and a group of cities with a total area of 338 dunams. Gal’s logic and methodology are as follows:

The site [from] which 625 people were exiled covered an area of [i.e., “would have covered an area of”] 15.6 dunams, and the other two sites [i.e., from which 650 and 656 people were exiled] were [i.e., would have been] 16 dunams. This is a typical size for Lower Galilee cities, including Tel Mador (1.43), Khirbet Abu Mudawer Tamra (1.45), Hurbat Shimshit (1.22), Hurbat Gamum (2.6), and others… Five cities with an area of between 40 and 60 dunams have been surveyed along with three additional sites containing areas between 14 and 20 dunams. Ten more sites had very limited areas and were rural in nature. The cumulative area of these cities is 440 dunams, theoretically representing 17,600 people – 4,048 more than the number listed in the Assyrian source. I argue then, that the Assyrian figures reflect reality, although they do not present the entire picture because of their fragmentary nature.

---

16 Gal, *Lower Galilee During the Iron Age*, 109. As noted above, Gal’s conclusion has been very influential. For instance, Jonathan Reed has written that “there are no villages, no hamlets, no farmsteads, nothing at all indicative of a population that could harvest the Galilean valleys for the Assyrian stores, much less sustained cultural and religious traditions through the centuries.” So also Mark Chancey: “The interior of Galilee, in short, was still relatively sparsely populated on the eve of the Maccabean campaigns.” See Jonathan L. Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence* (Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2000), 32; Chancey, *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee*, 44.
Annal 18

1’ …
2’ […] like a (dense) fog [I covered] him […]
3’ […] of 16 districts of Bit-[Humri]
(Islam)
I [demolished] ut[terly…]
4’ […]x captives from the city of …]bara, 625 captives from the city of […]
[…] 5’ […]x captives from the city of Hina-
tuna, 650 captives from the city of Ku[…]
[…] 6’ […]x captives from the city of Ya]tbite 656 captives from the city of Sa[…] 7’ […] the cities of Aruma and Marum […] 8’ […]Mitinti of] Ashkelon [broke] the loyalty oath […] and [revolted against me …]
9’ [The defeat of Re]zin He saw and in an attack of [panic/ insanity…]
[…] 10’ […]Rukibtu, the son of …] sat on his throne as [king …]
11’ […] he wandered around and beseeched me, 500 […] 12’ […] and I entered his city; 15 citi[es …
13’ […]I dibi’ilu the Arabian […]

Annal 24

1’ without (?) […] 2’ without (?) […] 3’ of 16 di[stricts of Bit-Humri (Israel) […] 4’ capt[ives from…]
[…] 5’ 226 [captives from…] 6’ captives [from …] […] 7’ 400 [(+ x) captives from …] […] 8’ 656 cap[tives from the city of Sa…]
(altogether) 9’ 13,520 [people…] 10’ with their belongings [I carried off to Assyria] [the cities of Aruma and Marum] 11’ [situated in] rugged mountains [I conquered (?) …]
12’ Mitinti of Ash[kelon] [broke the loyalty oath … and]
13’ re[volted] against me […] [the defeat of Rezin] 14’ he saw and was fri[ghtened …]
[…] 15’ [he was stricken] with panic […] 16’ Rukibtu, the son of […]

Table 1: Excerpt from The Annals of Tiglath-Pileser III17

17 Hayim Tadmor, The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III King of Assyria (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994), 80-83.
Although Gal’s number is cited far more often by scholars of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, Broshi and Finkelstein’s number of 93,750 for the total population of Galilee seems far more likely. They used a density coefficient of 250 inhabitants per hectare (i.e., 25 inhabitants per dunam; 38% smaller than Gal’s), a number that they arrived at by looking at both present-day settlements in traditional societies, which yield 200-250 inhabitants per hectare, and an analysis of the layout of four excavated Iron II sites, which yielded 270 inhabitants per hectare. Their population estimate for all of Western Palestine in the mid-eighth century BCE is ca. 400,000, and their population estimate for regions pertinent to this study are: 25,000 for Upper Galilee; 22,500 for Lower Galilee; 18,750 for the Huleh Valley; and 27,500 for the Jezreel Valley. Gal is right: the evidence is indeed fragmentary; but what we have suggests that it is much more likely that the Assyrians deported fewer than 25% than it is that they deported almost 75%.

The few other extant written sources do not help to clarify the situation. 2 Kings 15:29 recorded that Tiglath-Pileser captured “…Galilee [and] all the land of Naphtali; and he carried off the people to Assyria,” but any interpretation even approximating a numerical (or at least statistical) meaning of the phrase (כְּ הַלֵּיתֶנֶּלֶּי (“all the land of Naphtali”)) is impossible. Some scholars have pointed to the fact that Hezekiah is reported to have sent messengers north to call Jews to Jerusalem for Passover, and

---

18 Broshi and Finkelstein, “The Population of Palestine in Iron Age II,” 53ff. Their population estimates for Samaria are: Mt. Gilboa: 1,250; Mt. Carmel: 3000; Northern Samaria: 50,000; the city of Samaria: 15,000; Southern Samaria: 33,000 (total: 102,250).
19 E.g., 2 Kings 15:29: “In the days of King Pekah of Israel, King Tiglath-pileser of Assyria came and captured Ijon, Abel-beth-maacah, Janoah, Kedesh, Hazor, Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali; and he carried the people captive to Assyria” (בְּיָמֵי פַּחַה, יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּכָל-הַנַּחֲלָה שָׁם הָעָם מָשָׁר אֵל-אשור כְּ-הַלֵּיתֶנֶּלֶּי הַבָּרוֹךְ).
(only?) a few Galileans responded.\textsuperscript{20} 2 Kings recorded that both Jehoiakim and Hezekiah’s son Manasseh married Galilean women (but were they Israelites, and were they representative of many?).\textsuperscript{21} And the author of 2 Chronicles wrote that Josiah’s reforms in the 7\textsuperscript{th} century BCE reached “as far as Naphtali.”\textsuperscript{22} The information in these passages is so open to interpretation that they have been used as evidence by scholars on both sides of the debate.

Nevertheless, as can be seen in the quotes cited earlier in this chapter, most scholars of the Galilee have stated strong opinions as to whether or not there were Israelites living in the Galilee in this period (nearly all of them concluding that there were not), often using phrases such as “significantly depopulated” or “totally depopulated” to describe the situation after Tiglath-Pileser III. One fact that has been entirely neglected amidst the fray is that one’s conclusions about the state of affairs in the wake of the Assyrian conquest of the Northern Kingdom probably matter very little.\textsuperscript{23} We have no historical information for events in the Galilee during the rest of the Neo-Assyrian period (which lasted 120 years), the Neo-Babylonian period (which lasted 73 years), or the Persian period (which lasted 207 years). We have only slightly more information for the Ptolemaic and Seleucid periods, when the two empires fought over control of the region for 100 years before the Seleucids established themselves as the sole rulers for the 50 or so years prior to the rise of the Hasmoneans. Many things can happen in the course of 550 years regardless of whether 14\% or 77\% of the population was deported prior to it,

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{20} 2 Chronicles 30:10-11.\textsuperscript{21} 2 Kings 21:19; 22:36.\textsuperscript{22} 2 Chronicles 34:6.\textsuperscript{23} This is in contrast to the apparent conclusion of most modern scholars, who uniformly cite the deportations of the Galileans as \textit{prima facie} evidence for the cultural makeup of the Galilee in the late Hellenistic period. See references to Chancey, Horsley, Reed, Freyne, et al., above.}
and I can think of no other period of history in which scholars have assumed that one event changed a people group or a region to such a degree that it effectively lay desolate for half a millenium, especially in the face of silence from the sources. These scholars’ conclusions are all the more problematic given that major roads handling international travel and trade ran through the Galilee from the Iron Age to the Islamic period. Indeed, the entire recorded history of this bottleneck of a land bridge connecting Asia and Africa is characterized by kings, nations, and armies traveling through it and warring over it for one purpose or another. Even if that had not been the case and there was not only peace in the Middle East for 550 years, but for some reason there was no significant overland travel through it, Galilee contains some of the most agriculturally fertile land in the region. It does not make sense to conclude that the Galilee was an unknown, forgotten

24 Gal’s work constitutes one of the few archaeological surveys of Galilee that focuses on periods prior to the Hellenistic period (though see the references above on page 8, note 19, which include some new evidence). A new assessment of all survey data that includes any Iron or Persian period sites is in order. Such a study could begin with Condor’s Survey of Western Palestine and its related texts and include the following: William Foxwell Albright, “Some Archaeological and Topographical Results of a Trip through Palestine,” BASOR 11 (1923), 1-14; William Foxwell Albright, ”Archaeological and Topographical Explorations in Palestine and Syria,” BASOR 49 (1933), 23-31; Moshe Hortal, Northern Golan Heights: The Archaeological Survey as Source of Local History (Hebrew; Qazrin: Agaf HaAtiqot VeHaMuzeonim, 1989); Frankel et al., Settlement Dynamics and Regional Diversity in Ancient Upper Galilee: Archaeological Survey of Upper Galilee; Meyers, Strange, and Groh, ”The Meiron Excavation Project: Archaeological Survey in the Galilee and Golan, 1976,” Fig. 9; Shimon Dar, Landscape and Pattern: An Archaeological Survey of Samaria 800 B.C.E.-636 C. E. BAR International Series (Oxford: BAR, 1986); Israel Finkelstein, Zvi Ledeman, and Shlomo Bunimovits, Highlands of Many Cultures: The Southern Samaria Survey, The Sites. Monograph Series of the Institute of Archaeology, vol. 14 (Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology, 1997); Rafi Frankel and Nimrod Getzov, Archaeological Survey of Israel: Map of Achziv (1), Map of Hanita (2) (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 1997). The reference for Condor is C. R. Conder, Horatio Herbert Kitchener, and Edward Henry Palmer, The Survey of Western Palestine (London: The Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, 1881). Thanks to Kate Larson for allowing me to use references from her seminar paper on the history archaeological surveys in Israel/Palestine.

25 Not to mention that comparative evidence that suggests that it was standard practice for the Assyrians to resettle areas from which they deported people (as they did in Samaria), though there is no record of such activity occurring in Galilee. For roads, see Israel Roll, “Imperial Roads Across and Trade Routes Beyond the Roman Provinces of Judaea-Palaestina and Arabia: The State of Research,” Tel Aviv 32 (2005), 107-118; Israel Roll, ”Between Damascus and Megiddo: Roads and Transportation in Antiquity Across the Northeastern Approaches to the Holy Land.” in Man Near A Roman Arch: Studies Presented to Prof. Yoram Tsafir, ed. Leah Di Segni, et al. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2009).
backwater that was immune to change because of isolation. We simply cannot conclude that there was cultural and demographic stasis in the Galilee over a 550 year period based on fragmentary information at one end of the chronology and silence in between.

**Galilee in the Early Roman Period**

The other end of that chronological span is the Roman period. The writings of the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, when coupled with those of the New Testament gospels and archaeological finds, paint a picture in which the majority of the population in Lower Galilee was oriented toward Judaea with respect to religion, politics, and loyalty (if not identity). Jesus and his disciples – all from Lower Galilee – were Jerusalem Temple-oriented men who observed the Sabbath and the holy days (if not, perhaps, some of the purity laws). This is nowhere more evident than in Jesus’ crucifixion in Jerusalem at Passover and the book of Acts’ portrayal of Jesus’ disciples relocating to Jerusalem in the wake of his death so that they could be closer to the Temple. Although Jesus and his disciples only account for thirteen people in Galilee in the early first century CE, Jesus spent most of his time preaching about Jewish religion and values there, apparently gathering a large following, and it is clear that he both preached to Jews and was opposed by Jews (not gentiles). It is widely accepted that many towns – namely, Nazareth, Capernaum, Sepphoris, Shihin (Asochis), Cana, Jotapata, Tiberias, Terichaea/Magdala, Arbela, Chorazin, and Bethsaida in Lower Galilee, and Kfar Hananyah, Gischala/Gush Halav, Khirbet Shema’, Meiron, Nabratein, and Meroth in Upper Galilee – had Jewish populations in the 1st century CE. Gush Halav in Upper

26 In all fairness it should be noted that some have argued that the region was exploited for its agriculture but not inhabited as a result of most (if not all) of Galilee being designated as the King’s Land.
27 For examples of Jesus not observing (or at least protesting some contemporary Jewish groups’ interpretations of) purity laws, see, e.g., Mark 2:15-17; 7:1-23; Matthew 15:20; 23:25-26; Luke 11:37-41.
Galilee, in particular, seems to have had a population with strong political and religious ties to Jerusalem, for it was the hometown of John of Gischala, who was Josephus’ main rival for power over the Galilean forces rebelling against Rome and one of the rebel leaders in the last days of Jerusalem. Yodefat is also commonly assumed to have had a large Jewish population in the Early Roman period, as it was the site of a major battle between Josephus’ forces and the Romans and stone vessels have been excavated there.\footnote{Douglas R. Edwards, "Jotapata" in Ephraim Stern, ed., \textit{NEAEHL}, 3:252 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993); Douglas Edwards, Mordechai Aviam, and David Adan-Bayewitz, "Yodefat, 1992," \textit{IEJ} 45 (1995), 191-197; 195-196; David Adan-Bayewitz and Mordechai Aviam, "Jotapata, Josephus, and the Siege of 67: Preliminary Report on the 1992-1994 Seasons," \textit{JRA} 10 (1997), 131-165: 151-153, 164.}

Stone vessels were, according to Rabbinic texts, impervious to impurity and therefore have become a universal marker in the archaeological record for the presence of Jews. Though the textual evidence for this practice dates to the 3rd century CE,\footnote{See, e.g., \textit{m. Kelim} 2.1; 4.4; 10.1.} the presence of these vessels in 1st century CE strata, combined with the Mishnah’s dependence on the Hebrew Bible and both literary and religious traditions that go back to the 1st century CE, if not before, suggest that at least some shared these purity concerns in the 1st century.

Although stone vessels have also been found outside of Palestine in the Roman period (e.g., at Pompeii), and Livy and Varro mention them in non-Jewish contexts, within Palestine they have not been found at “non-Jewish” sites (e.g., the Decapolis and coastal cities), but have been found at the Lower Galilean sites of Sepphoris,\footnote{Over 100 fragments.} Capernaum,\footnote{Up to 150 fragments – see Jonathan L. Reed, "Galileans, 'Israelite Village Communities,' and the Sayings Gospel Q," in \textit{Galilee Through the Centuries: Confluence of Cultures}, ed. Eric Meyers (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1999).} Meiron,\footnote{One stone cup – see Eric M. Meyers, James F. Strange, and Carol L. Meyers, \textit{Excavations at Ancient Meiron, Upper Galilee, Israel, 1971-72, 1974-75, 1977}, Meiron Excavation Project (Cambridge, Mass.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1981), 152.} Kfar Hananyah,\footnote{One handle, perhaps dating to the first century CE or earlier – see David Adan-Bayewitz, "Kefar Hananyah, 1987," \textit{IEJ} 39 (1989), 98-99.} Gamla,\footnote{One handle – see Douglas R. Edwards, Mordechai Aviam, and David Adan-Bayewitz, "Yodefat, 1992," \textit{IEJ} 45 (1995), 191-197; 195-196.} Hammat Tiberias,\footnote{One stone cup – see Carol L. Meyers, \textit{Excavations at Ancient Meiron, Upper Galilee, Israel, 1971-72, 1974-75, 1977}, Meiron Excavation Project (Cambridge, Mass.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1981), 152.} Nabratein,\footnote{Over 100 fragments.} Khirbet Shema,
Ibelin, Bethlehem of Galilee, and Migdal Ha-Emeq. Stone vessels of unknown or unstratified contexts have also been found at Nazareth, Asochis/Shikhin, and Tiberias, and the village of Reina, north of Nazareth in Lower Galilee, has been identified as a production center for stone vessels. A less certain marker of Jewish presence than limestone vessels (but no less certainly cited as evidence) are miqva’ot (Jewish ritual baths), which were also associated with purity concerns. Archaeologists have interpreted them as having been found at Sepphoris, Yodefat, Nazareth, Tiberias, Gamla.

---


39 Magen, “The Stone Vessel Industry During the Second Temple Period,” in ‘Purity Broke Out in Israel’: Stone Vessels in the Late Second Temple Period, 8. Though it is assumed that Reina was a Jewish village (not least because of its location), it is worth considering that the fact that its inhabitants produced stone vessels does not necessarily mean that Reina was a Jewish village.


Chorazin, Beit Yinam, Beit Shearim, Har Arbel, Khirbet Shema, and Sasa. That said, the interpretation of a stepped, plastered pool as a *miqveh* is often problematic, and, as was mentioned above, debates of their interpretation and their status as a marker for the presence of Jews in the material record have not infrequently erupted in scholarly literature. The absence of pig bones and the presence of secondary burial in ossuaries, both of which are less reliable but nevertheless assumed markers of Jewish presence, have been found at Kafr Kanna, Meiron, Qiryat Tiv'on (near Beit She’arim), and in the modern town of Nazareth ‘Illit. Finally, first century CE synagogues have been excavated at Gamla in the Golan Heights and at Migdal and (possibly) Capernaum on the northern shore of the Dead Sea.

It is also worth noting that Josephus wrote in multiple places that he and two other priests were sent to the Galilee not just to bring rebel elements under control of the new central government in Jerusalem, but also to collect tithes (*Life* 63). Whether or not this is

---


43 For Nazareth, Tiberias, Yodefat, and Gamla see Reed, "Galileans, 'Israelite Village Communities,' and the Sayings Gospel Q," in *Galilee Through the Centuries: Confluence of Cultures*, 87-108.


44 See, e.g., Sanders, *Jewish law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*; Reich, "The Hot Bath-House (*balneum*), the Miqweh, and the Jewish Community in the Second Temple Period."; Eshel, "A Note on 'Miqvaot' at Sepphoris," in *Archaeology and the Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods*; Eshel, "The Pools of Sepphoris: Ritual Baths or Bathtubs: They're Not Ritual Baths."; Meyers, "Yes, They Are."; Reich, "They Are Ritual Baths."; Adler, "Ritual Baths Adjacent to Tombs: An Analysis of the Archaeological Evidence in Light of the Halakhic Sources."

45 Bone profiles have not been published with any consistency, but scholars have made much of the (relative) lack of pig bones at Sepphoris prior to the Byzantine period. See Billy J Grantham, "Sepphoris: Ethnic Complexity at an Ancient Galilean City" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1996).


an indication of piety on the part of Galileans, or simply civil law under the High Priest, is open to debate. In addition, Josephus, as a representative of the Jerusalem government, apparently planned to demolish Herod’s palace in Tiberias on account of it containing figures of living creatures (which, he wrote, were prohibited by Jewish law). And when two nobles of King Agrippa defected from Trachonitis to Josephus, the “Jews” (Ἰουδαίοι) wanted to circumcise them if the nobles were to live among them (Life 112-113).

All of these examples serve to exemplify what has long been the conclusion of scholars, namely that there was a sizeable Jewish population in Lower Galilee in the Roman period. But to what degree have research questions such as How Jewish was the Galilee? determined not only the answers but also the conceptual framework within which we think about the Galilee? Though the absence of pig bones and the presence of stone vessels, *miqva’ot*, and secondary burial practices might indeed be archaeological markers of a Jewish presence, it is important to honestly question just how much they tell us. The total evidence from the archaeological sites listed above accounts for 1 stone cup, 1 stone cup handle, and 250 fragments of stone vessels (all of which came from from two sites); a disputed number of *miqva’ot*, not to exceed 24 (according to Reich, who has an inclusive definition of what constitutes a *miqveh*; or 2, according to Lawrence); and a

---

49...καθαρεθῆναι τὸν οἶκον τὸν ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου τοῦ τετράρχου κατασκευασθέντα ζώων μορφὰς ἐχοντα. – Life 64ff.
50 There is an ongoing debate as to whether Ἰουδαίοι should be translated as “Jews” or “Judaeans.” For a good survey of the discussion and a compelling argument for the latter translation see Mason, “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History.”
handful of tombs with ossuaries. For how many Jews might we reasonably suggest that these finds are evidence? In raising this question I am not suggesting that population numbers for Jews must match the number of “Jewish” finds, nor that Jews did not inhabit the Galilee in the Roman period. Rather, I am again asking what we mean when we use the term “Jew” for inhabitants of Lower Galilee in antiquity and I am pointing out that modern scholars have routinely assumed a Jewish majority in Galilean villages, towns, and cities based on the New Testament and Josephus, and continue to use the archaeological record to confirm it. The archaeological record, however, contains, on the whole, very little archaeological evidence for the artificial second order academic category that has been labeled “Jews” and that has been used to interpret many archaeological sites.

The textual evidence must be critically examined as well. All of our sources are essentially Jewish in origin, and Josephus was clearly trying to present a Jewish perspective on Jews to his audiences, with only peripheral concern for non-Jews. Moreover, the presence of non-Jews in Jewish sources is almost always passed over by scholars. Matthew 8.5ff and Luke 7:1-10 note the presence of a non-Jewish centurion in Capernaum, the fishing village in which Jesus based his ministry. Presumably this man came to Capernaum to seek Jesus’ help, and was not a resident of the village, but unless one argues that this story is entirely a literary device, it suggests the presence of a non-Jewish army commander in the region. The city of Tiberias, built ca. 18-20 CE, was apparently built over tombs, rendering the city itself unclean to Jews concerned with

---

52 Sources such as Strabo and Pliny provide general information, but nothing in depth. And although one can argue that the gospel of Luke, for instance, was written by a gentile, he was obviously focusing on Jewish concerns, not to mention likely working from a Jewish source (the Gospel of Mark).
purity. However, as Josephus described it, this probably would not have mattered very much, since Herod Antipas filled it with “a promiscuous rabble, no small contingent being Galilean, with such as were drafted from territory subject to him and brought forcibly to the new foundation… Herod accepted as participants even poor men who were brought in to join the others from any and all places of origin. It was a question whether some were even free beyond cavil.” That said, Josephus – a priest – apparently did not have a problem with entering Tiberias, and he met with Jews in a synagogue there to decide how the city would respond to the advancing Roman army. On the other hand, the agoranomos in 31 CE was “Gaius Julias,” not a traditional Jewish name (though that does not necessarily mean that he was not “Jewish”), while in 43 CE the agoranomoi were Iaesias [son of] Mathias and Animos (or, perhaps, Aianimos) [son of] Monimos. There is suggestion of Roman cremation practices at Cana, which, given the common assumption that Palestinian Jews in the Second Temple period were averse to cremation,

53 Ant. 18.36-38; War 2.168; y. Shev. 9:1 (38d); Genesis Rabbah 79:6; Pesiga deRav Kahana § 11; Qohelet Rabbah 10:8 (26b); Lee I. Levine, “R. Simeon b. Yohai and the Purification of Tiberias: History and Tradition,” HUCA 49 (1978), 143-185; Jeffrey L. Rubenstein, Talmudic Stories: Narrative Art, Composition, and Culture (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 105-138.
54 Or, “as Josephus’ source described it…”
55 Ant. 18.36-38: Ἡρώδης δὲ ὁ τεταράχης ἐπὶ μέγα γὰρ ἦν τῷ Τίβεριῳ φιλίᾳ προκείμενον οἰκοδομεῖται πόλιν ἐπώνυμον αὐτῷ Τιβεριάδα τοῖς κρασίνασις ἐπικτίασα αὐτὴν τὰς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ λίμνῃ τῇ Γεινησαρίτειδι θερμᾷ τε οὐκ ἀποθεόν ἐστιν ἐν κώμῃ Ἀμμοθῶς ἄνομα αὐτή 37 σύγκλιδες δὲ ὥρκισαν οὐκ ὁλιγὼν δὲ καὶ τὸ Γαλιλαῖον ἦν καὶ δοσὶ μὲν ἐκ τῆς ὑπ’ αὐτῷ γῆς ἁναγκαστοι καὶ πρὸς βιαν εἰς τὴν κατοικίαν ἐγκαϊσαν τινὲς δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐν τέλει ἐδέξατο δὲ αὐταῖς συνοίκοις καὶ τοὺς παραχέθεν ἐπισυμμεβαίνους ἄνθρακες ἄπορους 38 ἔστι β’ ὡς μὲν ἀσφάλως ἐλευθέρους πολλὰ τε αὐτοῦ κατ’ πολλὰς ἡλευθέρους καὶ εὐπρεπεῖσθαι ἐνέκρισαν τούτων ἡμᾶς ἁπολείψαν τὴν πόλιν ἐπιτειλείς κατασκευάζεις τε ἐκτήσων τέλεια τοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ γῆς ἐπιτάσσει εἰδῶς παράμονον τὸν οἰκεῖον δύνα καὶ ἀπὸ τὸν Ῥωμαίου πατρίου διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ μνῆμαν ἀ πολλὰ τίνες ἁνεξημένους τὴν ἱδρυσιν τῇ Τιβεριάδι γενέσθαι μιαρὺς δὲ εἶπεν ἐπὶ ἑμέρας εἶναι τοὺς οἰκήτορας ἀγορεύει ήμᾶς τὸ νόμιμον…
56 Life 277-9.
would suggest a non-Jewish presence.\textsuperscript{58} In \textit{Life} 368-372 (and the parallel in \textit{War} 2.622) Josephus offers amnesty to the followers of John of Gischala if they join him. Four thousand join Josephus and John is left with none but “his own citizens, and about fifteen hundred strangers that came from the metropolis of Tyre.”\textsuperscript{59} Even Paneas, a patently “pagan” city on the northern edge of Upper Galilee, had Jews living among a non-Jewish majority, for they asked John of Gischala to send them pure oil so that they would not have to transgress the Torah by using the oil of the Greeks.\textsuperscript{60}

Again, the suggestion is not that Jews did not make up a large portion of the Galilean population; rather, it is to point out that the foci and agendas of our authors are Judeo-centric, that the extant literary sources have been preserved largely for religious reasons, and that the vast majority of modern historical and archaeological research has had as its goal the project of learning more about the Jews in Roman Galilee. As a result, the picture of an almost entirely Jewish Galilee is entirely understandable…and also not entirely accurate. A further issue, which I will raise but not pursue here, is the question of what “Jewish” means in a statement such as “the majority of the population was Jewish.” Does it mean that they were religiously the same as the Judeans? That they were politically aligned with the Judeans? That they worshipped at the Jerusalem Temple? That they followed certain purity laws (e.g., used stone vessels and \textit{miqva’ot})? That they saw themselves as sharing in the history, lineage, and ancestral laws of the


\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Life} 372: µόνοι δὲ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ παρέμειναν οἱ πολίται καὶ ξένους τινές ἐκ τῆς Τυρίου μητροπόλεως ὡς χίλιοι καὶ πεντακόσιοι Ἰοανής μὲν οὖν οὕτω καταστρατηγηθεὶς ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι περίφοβος ἐμεῖνεν.

\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Life} 70-76. Cf. \textit{War} 2.585-594.
Judaeans? That they only married other “Jews”? That they attended a synagogue regularly? That they did not have idols or amulets of other gods? That they paid tithes and/or taxes to the Jerusalem Temple? Certainly the outward practice of religion has become a major defining characteristic of the second order academic category called “Jews.” But the real-life situation in Roman Galilee was not quite so black-and-white as the categories that modern academia has created for study.

**Galilee in Regional Politics**

From a political perspective, it is important to understand the several unions and divisions that occurred in this region between the Hasmonean revolt (167 BCE) and the revolt of 66-73 CE. The Hasmonean revolt began in Modi’in, ca. 20 km northwest of Jerusalem, in 167 BCE, and it initially resulted in a sphere of influence (one can hardly call it a “kingdom” in its earlier phases) centered around Jerusalem, the capital of Judaea. According to Josephus and 1st and 2nd Maccabees, the Hamonean rulers attained more power and land as time went on. Jonathan (161-142 BCE) annexed a portion of Peraea, a region just east of Judaea along the Dead Sea, and another small area just north of Judaea. Simon (142-134 BCE) annexed Jaffa and Gezer. John Hyrcanus (134-104 BCE) annexed Samaria, the coastal region between Jaffa and the territory of Ashkelon, and Idumaea (to the south of Judaea. Aristobulus I (104-103 BCE) added Galilee and Ituraea, if one sentence in Josephus can be trusted. And Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE) added Gaulanitis, Gilead (including a few of the Decapolis cities), the coast from Mt. Carmel to Apollonia, southern Peraea, southern Idumaea, and Gaza. At its greatest extent, under Alexander Jannaeus, the Hasmonaean kingdom apparently included Peraea, Gaulanitis, at least part of Ituraea, Galilee, Samaria, Judaea, Idumaea, and Gaza. The only portion of
the coast not controlled by the Hasmonaeans was the territory of Ascalon and the coast north of Mt. Carmel.

When Pompey arrived in the region in 64 BCE, he had to intervene in a civil war between the last of the Hasmonaeans, Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II. According to Josephus, the result was that all of these regions were made a part of the Roman province of Syria, and he took the Decapolis cities and the coastal cities away from Judaean rule, granting them a state of semi-autonomy. In 41 BCE Marc Antony appointed Herod (“the Great”) and his brother Phasael joint tetrarchs of Judaea on behalf of the Romans, and in 38 BCE Herod conquered Galilee. He continued to expand the area of his rule, and by 20 BCE Herod ruled a single kingdom that included the regions of Ituraea, Batanaea, Trachonitis, Gaulanitis, Auranitis, Galilee, Samaria, Judaea, Peraea, and Idumaea. When Herod died in 4 BCE, his kingdom was divided between his sons. Archæleus received Idumaea, Judaea, and Samaria; Antipas received Peraea and Galilee; Philip received Auranitis, Trachonitis, Batanaea, Gaulanitis, and Ituræa; and Salome received two small areas – one on the west bank of the Jordan River, between Phaesalis and Archæalis, and another on the coast of the Mediterranean, between Yavneh and Ashdod. The Decapolis, the region between Ashdod and Gaza, the Phœnician coast, and Chalcis were overseen by the Roman procurator in Syria.

While it might be tempting to see these imperially-decreed divisions and reunions as having occurred along ethnic lines (on a model such as Pompey taking the Decapolis and coastal cities away from the Hasmonaeans on the grounds of the population not being Jewish), it is unlikely that this was the case. There were times in which imperial powers decided that cities and regions annexed to Judæa either must or were not required to
follow Judaean ancestral laws (e.g., in the letter from Demetrius to Jonathan – see below, Chapter 3), but the regions themselves were topographically defined (and, as was suggested for the Galilee, above, were likely of mixed populations). So Josephus described the regions of Samaria and Judaea not as “the place that Samaritans live,” or “the place that Judaeans live” – a distinction that he makes elsewhere. Rather, he wrote that “[Samaria] is entirely of the same nature as Judaea, for both countries are made up of hills and valleys, are moist enough for agriculture, and are very fruitful… And, as the greatest sign of excellence and abundance, both [regions] are very full of people.” In like fashion, the “border” between Upper and Lower Galilee is an east-west “line,” to the north of which there is a sharp escarpment and an increase in elevation, and to the south of which are lowland valleys separated by hills. Likewise, according to Josephus, the division between Galilee and Samaria is the wide, flat Jezreel valley (τὸ μέγα πεδίον, “the great plain” – e.g., War 3.39), with Samaria being the hilly region to the south.

The same can be said for the other regions that Josephus describes. When he does make comments that on the surface may seem to be areas designated by people groups (e.g., “Carmel, a mountain that had formerly belonged to the Galileans, but now belonged to the Tyrians,” or “[Galilee’s] northern parts are bounded by Tyre and the country of the Tyrians”), closer examination makes it clear that he does not have an ethnic group in mind, but cities, inhabitants of cities, and hinterlands controlled by cities.

---

61 War 3.48-50.
62 For another instance of this reference to the Jezreel Valley, see War 2.188. For a non-Josephan reference, see Judith 1:8 (τὸ μέγα πεδίον Ἑσδρήλων). For a more precise placement of Ἑσδρήλων in Judith, see 4:6 and 7:3.
63 War 3.35.
64 War 3.38.
This conclusion is bolstered by the names of the regions themselves. Judaea, Samaria, and Galilee are carry-overs from the Hebrew Bible; the rest of the regional names probably reflect their topography. Trachonitis (Τραχων/τίτις) comes from the Greek word τραχών, referring to a rugged, stony tract of land. Auranitis (Αυραν/τίτις) is from the Hebrew name for a regional mountain (חרר), and perhaps from a word meaning “black land,” i.e., a basaltic region. Batanaea is also a Hebrew name, from the Hebrew locale (which itself is a cognate of the adjective meaning “smooth” or “fertile”), and occurs in the Greek as Βασάν, Βασαν/τις, and Βαταναία. Gaulanitis received its name, according to Eusebius, from a “great city” within it. Though arguments made from etymologies are notoriously difficult to sustain, and as such I will not push this point very hard, this particular line of reasoning is most significant in that there is no evidence that these regional names have any connection with ethnic groups. As far as Josephus’ description of Galilee and the surrounding regions goes in War 3.35-58, regional borders are topographic determinations, and this can be easily seen not only by observing the way

---

65 Though it is interesting – and important from a historical-etymological perspective – that the first instance of שָמַריה ['Samaria'] is in 1 Kings, and that its etymology is connected to Omri’s purchase of a hill from a man named Shemer. See 1Kings 16:24. Also, as noted above, it is possible – if not likely – that “Galilee” is geographical as well. See page 35, footnote 6.


68 See Eusebius, Onomasticon, “Basan” – Βασάν...ἀνευ ἔστι Βασαν/τίς, ἢ νὲν καλομένη Βαταναία.

69 Eusebius, Onomasticon, “Gaulon or Golan (Golam)”: “Now a great city (large village) called Golan in the Batanaia. The city and the district have the same name. (From this name the whole region is also named.)”

70 For an example of somebody writing a geographical description of the Mediterranean based on ethnic distinctions (which, though 400 years earlier than Josephus, nevertheless highlights the differences that an ethnic vs. topographical framework can make), see Pseudo-Scylax’s Periplus, e.g., Patrick Counillon and Scylax, Pseudo-Skylax: le périple du Pont-Euxin: texte, traduction, commentaire philologique et historique. Scripta Antiqua (Bordeaux; Paris: Ausonius; Diffusion De Boccard, 2004).
in which Josephus describes the regions, but also by simply looking at a topographical map of the area.

**Kedesh in the Literary Record**

Topographical boundaries probably go a long way toward explaining why Josephus is so often seems to contradict himself when describing where a town or village is. In *Ant.* 5.63 Josephus described Kedesh as “also a place in Galilee,” and in *Ant.* 5.91 as “a place of the Upper Galilee.” However, in *Ant.* 13.154 he describes Kedesh as a place that “lies between the land of the Tyrians and the Galilee.” There are many other examples of this phenomenon, and the most plausible explanation is twofold: (1) the concept of borders as entailing lines on a map is a modern one, and not applicable to the ancient world, and (2) as far as the specific case of Josephus goes, his regional designations were topographical and therefore somewhat general.

The earliest reference to Kedesh is in Joshua 20:7, where it is listed as the Levite city in the territory of the tribe of Naphtali after the Exodus.\(^71\) In the monarchical period, the Israelite king Solomon is said to have put Ahinadab over the affairs of all Galilee as far as Sidon,\(^72\) and also to have given twenty cities in the Galilee to Hiram the king of Tyre, who was not pleased with them and named the area אֶרֶץ כְּנַרְיָה (“the land of the border”), which the text says is “a name that they have until this day.”\(^73\) Kedesh is not mentioned in this passage, and may not have been associated with this gift (even if we assume the historicity of the text, which is uncertain).\(^74\) Kedesh is also mentioned twice

---


\(^{72}\) *Ant.* 8.36.

\(^{73}\) 1 Kings 9:11ff.; *Ant.* 8.142.

\(^{74}\) Also interesting is that Josephus does not understand אֶרֶץ כְּנַרְיָה as “border,” but as a Phoenician word for “that which does not please.”
in the Zenon papyri. However, until the most recent excavations little else was known of Kedesh as a town apart from Josephus’ writings at the end of the 1st century CE.

Josephus’ mapping of the Galilean borders (above) puts Kedesh either on the northern border of Upper Galilee or just north of it, which makes sense of his seemingly paradoxical statements that the Canaanite kings “pitched their camp at Beeroth, a city of the Upper Galilee, not far from Kedesh, which is itself also a place in Galilee,” then that Kedesh was “a place that lies between the land of the Tyrians and Galilee” when retelling a story from 1 Maccabees, and finally that Kedesh was a city belonging to Tyre and hostile to the Jews in his own day. These statements also stand to underline a few points that have been made above: (a) textually and archaeologically Galilee was divided between Upper and Lower, and the majority of Jews who lived in Galilee in the Hellenistic and Roman periods lived in Lower Galilee; and (b) the most northern village or town for which we have evidence for significant Jewish presence is Gischala (Gush Halav) on the western side of the Huleh Valley (and then only in the late 1st century CE) and Gamla on the eastern side (see Figure 1). So what was Jonathan doing up there, so far from home, and what did he do after he defeated the Seleucid army and encamped at Kedesh?

76 Ant. 5.63.
77 ...μεταξὺ δὲ ἐστὶν αὐτὴ τῆς τῶν Τυρίων γῆς καὶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας... (Ant. 13.154).
Chapter 3
Evidence for Early Jewish Expansion into the Galilee and an Analysis of 1 Maccabees, Josephus, and the Hasmonaean Settlements

The majority of scholars would say that the Hasmonaeans annexed Galilee to Judaea in 104-103 BCE. The Maccabean revolt against Antiochus IV in 167 BCE had led to a slowly expanding kingdom, and by 145 BCE Jonathan was given military oversight of the region as far north as Damascus, and his brother Simon was, according to 1 Maccabees, made the governor of the coast “from Egypt to the Ladder of Tyre.” As noted above, Simon, who ruled from 142-135 BCE, added Gezer and Joppa to Judaea, and his son, John Hyrcanus I (ruled 134-104 BCE), expanded Judaea’s borders to include Samaria and Idumaea. However, it was not until the reign of his son Aristobulus I (104-103 BCE) that the borders of the Hasmonaean kingdom were extended as far north as Galilee, at least according to Josephus:

[Aristobulus I] was called a lover of the Greeks; and had conferred many benefits on his own country, and made war against Ituraea, and added a great part of it to Judaea, and compelled the inhabitants, if they would continue in that country, to be circumcised, and to live according to the

---


2 1 Macc. 11:59-62. The Ladder of Tyre is the beginning of the semi-mountainous region at the modern coastal border between Israel and Lebanon.
He was naturally a man of candour, and of great modesty, as Strabo bears witness, in the name of Timagenes; who says thus: “This man was a person of candor, and very serviceable to the Jews; for he added a country to them, and obtained a part of the nation of the Ituraeans for them, and bound them to them by the bond of circumcision. (Antiquities 13.318-319)\(^3\)

Galilee is not mentioned in this passage, but given that the Ituraeans were probably located somewhere in the region of Mt. Hermon or in Lebanon,\(^4\) this passage has consequently been interpreted to mean that Aristobulus annexed Galilee to Judaea by virtue of the fact that Galilee is located between Ituraea and Judaea. However, this conclusion has been challenged by a minority of scholars, who have suggested that Josephus’ evidence is misleading. The passage constitutes the entirety of what we know about any conquest of the Ituraeans; nothing of the sort is mentioned in Josephus’ first composition about Aristobulus, War 1.84 (indeed, the only mention at all of the Ituraeans comes in Antiquities, which was written ca. 20 years after War). Furthermore, what we have comes in an incredibly sweeping, polemical statement that is followed by a third-hand report from Timagenes via Strabo. We know little to nothing about Timagenes; he is probably the rhetor Timagenes of Alexandria who was taken to Rome as a captive in 55 BCE and who wrote many books including an anti-Roman, “hellenocentric and

\(^{3}\) δ’ ἐπισπενδόκιον τοίμον ἀληθείαν ταύτῃ εἰπὼν ἐπαρθήνησε τοῖς λόγοις βασιλείας ἐνεπαιτῶν χρηματίας μὲν Ἡλείλην πολλὰ δ’ εὐεργετήσας τὴν πατρίδα πολεμίσας Τουραίοις καὶ πολλῆν αὐτῶν τῆς χώρας τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ προσκτηραμένος ἀναγκάζεται τοὺς ἐνυκλὶτέας εἰναι μένειν ἐν τῇ χώρῃ περιτέμνεσθαι καὶ κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίων νόμοις ζῆν 319. φοβεῖ δ’ ἑπίεικεν κέρχητο καὶ σφόδρα ἢν αἰχόδαι ἀτομῶν ἢς μαρτυρεῖ τούτῳ καὶ Ἐστράβων ἐκ τοῦ Τυμαγένους ἄνδρας λέγον ὑπὸ τῶν ἑπεικοῦς τοὺς ἑγείτον ὁ άνήρ καὶ πολλὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων χρήσιμος χώραν τῇ γὰρ τούτῳ προσκτῆσαν καὶ τὸ μέρος τοῦ τῶν Τυραίων ἄθνων ἀκειμένος ἄδεψαν συνάψας τῇ τῶν αἰχόδαις περιτομῆ.

\(^{4}\) Some have suggested that perhaps they had expanded southward into Galilee, but this is a minority opinion for which there is no evidence whatsoever, archaeological or otherwise. See Dar, History of the Hermon: Sites of the Ituraeans; Dar, Settlements and Cult Sites on Mount Hermon, Israel: Ituraean Culture in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods; Myers, The Ituraeans and the Roman Near East: Reassessing the Sources.
barbophile” book called *On Kings*.\(^5\) His statement that Aristobulus was “a man of candor and very serviceable to the Jews” (and Josephus’ paraphrase of it) is in direct (and bizarre) contradiction to Josephus’ portrayal of him both in *War* and earlier in *Antiquities* as a brutal ruler who killed his mother and brother.

Some have suggested that if Aristobulus had any interaction with the Ituraeans, it was more likely to have been on the level of an alliance than a conquest.\(^6\) The probability that the process of converting and administering a people group so far from Judaea could have been completed in Aristobulus’ one year reign (104-103 BCE) seems unlikely, and without Josephus’ interpretive comment (\([\text{Άριστόβουλος πολεµήσας Ιτουραίους]}\) we would have no evidence whatsoever of an act of war. Furthermore, there is no reference to any occupation of Galilee or Ituraea after Aristobulus I and, as Bar-Kochva has pointed out, Josephus’ suggestion that inhabitants of certain Galilean settlements did not fight to defend themselves on the Sabbath in 103 BCE seems to be unlikely behavior for new converts (e.g., Asochis in *Ant*. 13.337).\(^7\) The only other people reported to have been forcibly converted to Judaism through circumcision are the Idumaeans (note the similarity of the name),\(^8\) an account of which comes to us also from Josephus and Strabo.

---


\(^{8}\) While it is highly unlikely that Josephus would have mixed them up, it is not inconceivable that Timagenes, Strabo, or a copyist might have.
as well as Ptolemy the Historian. In that case, Josephus and Ptolemy wrote that the Idumaeans were forced to circumcise and observe Jewish laws and customs, while Strabo wrote that the Idumaeans were Nabataeans who joined the Judaeans (“and shared in the same customs with them”) after being banished from Nabataea following an uprising. Kasher has argued that none of these accounts is entirely correct, but that Strabo is likely to be the most accurate on the issue of circumcision because (a) Strabo was repulsed by the Jewish custom of circumcision and disliked the Hasmonaeans, and would likely have seized on any opportunity to report them as forcibly circumcising another nation; (b) Josephus is using a later source (probably Nicolaus of Damascus) whose writings were anti-Hasmonaean; (c) Josephus reported to his Roman audience on other occasions that he prevented the forcible circumcision of a gentile; and (d) as far as we can tell, the Idumaeans already practiced circumcision.

On the other hand, a lack of reference to the occupation of the Galilee after Aristobulus I does not mean that there was not one, and there is no reason to think that the Galilee was entirely devoid of Jews prior to Aristobulus, so Asochis need not be representative of new converts. The complications involved in converting and administering a new people group and region far from Judaea could explain why the Ituraeans are autonomous in all subsequent representations of them. The above critiques of Josephus are valid, but at most they call Josephus’ account into question. This debate over the legitimacy of Josephus’ statements about Aristobulus’ annexation of Galilee

---

9 Ant. 13.257-258; 15.254-255; Stern, GLAJJ I.146; Strabo, Geog. 15, 2, 34. What follows is the argument of Kasher, Jews, Idumaeans, and Ancient Arabs: Relations of the Jews in Eretz-Israel with the Nations of the Frontier and the Desert During the Hellenistic and Roman Era (332 BCE-70 CE), 46ff.
10 Kasher also argues from later rabbinic material that forced circumcision was against the law, but this line of reasoning is anachronistic. See Kasher, Jews, Idumaeans, and Ancient Arabs: Relations of the Jews in Eretz-Israel with the Nations of the Frontier and the Desert During the Hellenistic and Roman Era (332 BCE-70 CE), 46-77.
might be further elucidated by evidence for expansion into the region earlier than Aristobulus (e.g., earlier expansion or attempts at expansion could have laid the groundwork for whatever alliance or conquest that might have occurred in 104/3 BCE). In other words, the important question is not whether Aristobulus expanded Judaean territory to include Galilee, but whether he was the first to do so. There are two ways to go about answering this question: by comparing the Squatter stratum at Tel Kedesh to known texts and to known archaeological remains.

**Judaea and “the Three Districts Being Added To it From Samaria and Galilee”**

Let us return to the argument, mentioned above, that 1 Maccabees’ account of the letters written to Jonathan by Demetrius I and Demetrius II, in which they promise to add three districts to Judaea from Samaria and Galilee, are evidence of either the Judaization or administration of the Galilee (see Table 2 and Appendix III). They are important not only because Galilee appears in these letters in the context of territory added to Judaea by Seleucid rulers, but because the letters are chronologically proximal to the battle below Kedesh in 143 BCE.

**The Letter of Demetrius I (ca. 152 BCE)**

In 152 BCE Alexander Balas, a pretender to the Seleucid throne, landed at Acco-Ptolemais, threatening the ruling king, Demetrius I. Demetrius decided that it would be best to secure Jonathan’s support before Alexander did, and so he sent Jonathan a letter that authorized the release of Judaean hostages that had been kept in the citadel in Jerusalem, allowed Jonathan to recruit and arm troops, and made him an ally. Not

---

11 See Table 2 for comparisons of the texts and Appendix III for all of all texts discussed here.
wanting to be outdone, Alexander also sent a letter to Jonathan, proclaiming Jonathan high priest and a Friend of the King. Jonathan apparently accepted both offers, and Demetrius responded with a more detailed and generous letter. It stated, in part,

[I will not collect taxes] from the land of Judah or from the three *nomes* that are being added to it from Samaritis and Galilee from this day and for all time (τοῦ λαβείν ἀπὸ γῆς Ιουδαία καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τριών νομῶν τῶν προστιθεμένων αὐτῇ ἀπὸ τῆς Σαμαρίτιδος καὶ Γαλιλαίας ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄπαντα χρόνον – 1 Macc. 10:30).\(^{12}\)

Demetrius continued this train of thought in verse 38, writing,

And as for the three *nomes* that have been added to Judaea from the country (χώρα) of Samaria, let them be annexed to Judaea so that they may be considered to be under one ruler and obey no other authority than the high priest (καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς νομοὺς τοὺς προστεθέντας τῇ Ιουδαίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας Σαμαρείας προστεθήτω τῇ Ιουδαίᾳ πρὸς τὸ λογισθῆναι τοῦ γενέσθαι ὑπ’ ἐκα τοῦ μὴ ὑπακούσαι ἄλλης ἐξουσίας ἄλλ’ ἂν τοῦ ἄρχερέως).

It is curious that Demetrius here gives three *nomes* to Judaea from Samaria and Galilee, both because the *nome* was a Ptolemaic, not a Seleucid, administrative unit and because Samaria was between Galilee and Judaea, which would have created a situation in which districts added from Galilee would not be contiguous with Judaea.\(^{13}\) Josephus’ paraphrase of the letter in *Antiquities* 13.50 seems to reveal his confusion, as well as his attempt to make sense of it:

\(^{12}\) It is impossible to say if the meaning is that the taxes will not be collected ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄπαντα χρόνον, that the three districts will be added to Judaea ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄπαντα χρόνον, or both, though the latter seems the most likely.

\(^{13}\) This would not have been an entirely unique situation – every other coastal city south of the Ladder of Tyre was ruled by Sidon, and the intervening cities were ruled by Tyre (apparently to ensure that there would not be contiguous blocks of power). However, the fact that those were coastal cities may be important, as they can still be accessed, taxed, and ruled without crossing into other regions.
...and as to the tax which was necessary to pay to me for (the head of) each inhabitant of Judaea and of the three toparcies of Samaria and Galilee and Peraea which have been attached to Judaea, these I concede to you from now for all time (καὶ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἐκάστης ὁ ἔδει μοι δίδοσθαι τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰούδαίᾳ κατοικοῦντων καὶ τῶν τριῶν τοπαρχίων τῶν τῇ Ἰούδαίᾳ προσκειμένων Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας καὶ Περαιάς τούτων παραχωροὶ ἵμιν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὸν ἀπαντα χρόνου).

Josephus’ parallel to 1 Macc. 10:38 (Ant. 13.54) goes on to make explicit that only the Jews in those districts need obey the Torah (as opposed to all inhabitants, as 1 Maccabees suggested):

I give them permission to use their ancestral laws and to observe them, and I desire that those in the three nomes that were added to Judaea be subject to them; and I wish that it shall be the responsibility of the high priest that not a single Jew shall have any other temple for worship other than the one at Jerusalem (ἐπιτρέπω δὲ καὶ τοῖς πατριώις χρῆσθαι νόμους καὶ τούτως φυλάττειν καὶ τοῖς τρισίν τοῖς προσκειμένοις τῇ Ἰούδαίᾳ νομοῖς ὑποτάσσεσθαι βούλομαι καὶ τῷ ἀρχηγεῖ δὲ ἐπιμελέσει εἴναι ἵνα μηδὲ εἰς Ἰούδαίας ἄλλο ἔχῃ λειψάν προσκυνεῖν ἢ μόνον τὸ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμως).

So where 1 Maccabees was ambiguous, Josephus made the situation very clear: three toparcies (namely, Samaria, Galilee, and Peraea) have been added to Judaea and every Jew in them must observe the Torah. Is this just Josephus adding details in his

---

14 Nearly everybody has labeled the addition of Galilee and Peraea in this passage as a mistake and moved on without explanation. Seth Schwartz has noted Morton Smith’s suggestion that καὶ Περαιάς in Antiquities is a gloss and therefore it should be translated as “…of the three toparcies being added to Judaea from (= genitive of partition) Samaria-and-Galilee” – in other words, Josephus faithfully translated 1 Maccabees and somebody after Josephus did not understand it. Schwartz goes on to note that this would cause us to expect a preposition after προσκειµένων and perhaps some manuscript evidence that καὶ Περαιάς is a gloss, for which there is none. See Seth Schwartz, “The ‘Judaism’ of Samaria and Galilee in Josephus’s Version of the Letter of Demetrius I to Jonathan (Antiquities 13.48-57),” HTR 82, no. 4 (1989), 377-391. 381, n. 9

15 The subject of the phrase τοῖς τρισίν τοῖς προσκειµένοις τῇ Ἰούδαίᾳ νομοῖς ὑποτάσσεσθαι is not entirely clear. It is conceivable that the intent is that the residents of the three toparcies are to be subject to the high priest; it is far less likely that they are to be subject to the Jewish soldiers in Demetrius’ army, as Whiston’s translation suggests (though I do not think that this was the intent).
paraphrase to fit his rhetorical purposes, or is he including another source that the author of 1 Maccabees either did not have or did not include?

The Letter of Demetrius II (ca. 145 BCE)

1 Maccabees 11:28-38 provides further elucidation. By 145 BCE, Alexander had been killed, Ptolemy VI had died, Demetrius II had become king, and Jonathan was besieging the citadel in Jerusalem. An angry Demetrius II demanded that Jonathan end the siege and meet him at Acco-Ptolemais. When Jonathan came bearing gifts and won Demetrius’ favor, Demetrius reconfirmed Jonathan’s high priesthood and made Jonathan one of his chief Friends. According to 1 Maccabees, Jonathan then “asked the king to free Judaea and the three toparchies of Samaritis from tribute” (καὶ ἡξίωσεν Ἰωναθαν τὸν βασιλέα ποιῆσαι τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἀφορολόγητον καὶ τὰς τρεῖς τοπαρχίας καὶ τὴν Σαμαρίτιν – 1 Macc. 11:28). In response Demetrius wrote the following letter:

King Demetrius to his brother Jonathan and to the nation of the Jews, greetings. This copy of the letter that we wrote concerning you to our kinsman Lasthenes we have written to you also, so that you may know what it says. King Demetrius to his father Lasthenes, greetings. have determined to do good to the nation of the Jews, who are our friends and fulfill their obligations to us, because of the goodwill they show toward us. We have confirmed as their possession both the territory (δρμα) of Judaea and the three nomes of Apbairauma and Lydda and Rathamin; the latter, with all of the region bordering them, were added to Judaea from Samaritis ἑστάκαμεν αὐτοῖς τὰ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ τῶν τρεῖς νομῶν Ἀφαίρεμα καὶ Λυδᾶ καὶ Ραθάμιν προσέτησαν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς Σαμαρίτιδος καὶ πάντα τὰ συνυφροῦντα αὐτοῖς). To all those who offer sacrifice in Jerusalem we have granted release from the royal taxes that the king formerly received from them each year, from the crops of the land and the fruit of the trees. And the other payments henceforth due to us of the tithes, and the taxes due to us, and the salt pits and the crown taxes due to us – from all these we shall grant them release.  

16 For this argument, see Schwartz, "The 'Judaism' of Samaria and Galilee in Josephus's Version of the Letter of Demetrius I to Jonathan (Antiquities 13.48-57)."
not one of these grants shall be canceled from this time on forever. 37 Now therefore take care to make a copy of this, and let it be given to Jonathan and put up in a conspicuous place on the holy mountain. (1 Macc. 11:30-38) 17

Josephus has an account of Jonathan’s meeting with Demetrius as well, in addition to a copy of the letter that Demetrius wrote. Josephus began by paraphrasing 1 Macc. 11:28:

...when [Jonathan] petitioned [Demetrius] that he would demand no more than three hundred talents for the tribute of all Judaea and the three toparchies of Samaris, and Joppa, 18 and Galilee, [Demetrius] complied with the proposal, and gave him a letter confirming all those grants; the contents of which were as follows… ([...Ἰονάθου] παρακαλέσαντος αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀπάσης καὶ τῶν τριῶν τοπαρχιῶν Σαμαρείας καὶ Ἰόπης καὶ Γαλιλαίας τριακόσια τελή τάλαντα δίδωσιν καὶ περὶ πάντων ἐπιστολάς αἱ περιείχουν τούτων τῶν τρόπων – Ant. 13.125).

Josephus then proceeded to present a letter that, up until the end of the sentence in which Demetrius designates the three districts as “Aphairema, and Lydda, and Ramatha, which have been added to Judaea out of Samaria, with what appertains to them” (παρασχεῖν καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς νομοὺς Ἀφαίρεμα καὶ Λύδδα καὶ Ραμαθαίν οί τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ προσετέθησαν...)

17 βασιλεὶς Ἰησοῦς Ἰωανᾶθαν τῷ ἀδελφῷ χαίρειν καὶ ἔθινεν Ἰουδαίων 34 τὸ αὐτήγραφον τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ὡς ἐγράψαμεν Λαοθένει τῷ συγγενεῖ ἡμῖν περὶ ἡμῶν γεγραμμένον καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὅπως εἰδήτε βασιλεὺς Ἰησοῦς Ἰωανᾶθατ Τῷ πατρὶ χαίρειν 35 τῷ ἔθνει τῶν Ἰουδαίων πλήρους ἡμῶν καὶ συντηροῦσιν τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς δίκαια ἐκρίμασεν ἀγαθὸν ποιήσας χάριν τὴς ἡς εἰς αὐτῶν εὐνοίας πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἔστακαμεν αὐτοῖς τὰ τε δρια της Ἰουδαίας καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς νομοὺς Ἀφαϊρέμα καὶ Λύδδα καὶ Ραμαθαίν προσετέθησαν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ απὸ τῆς Σαμαρίτιδος καὶ πάντα τὰ συγκυριοῦσα αὐτοῖς πᾶσιν τοῖς Θυσιάζοσιν εἰς Ιεροσόλυμα αντὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν ὃν ἔλαμβανεν ὁ βασιλεὺς παρ’ αὐτῶν τὸ πρότερον κατ’ ἐναυτόν ἀπὸ τῶν γενιμάτων τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἀκροδρόμων 36 καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ ἀνήκουσα ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν τῶν δεκατῶν καὶ τῶν τελῶν τῶν ἀνήκουσα ἡμῖν καὶ τὰς ὅλας λίμνες καὶ τῶν ἀνήκουσας ἡμῖν στεφάνας πάντα ἐπερικείσασθαι αὐτοῖς 36 καὶ οὐκ ἐδείηθην αὐτοῖς ὡς ἐν τοῖς νῦν εἰς τῶν ἀπαντί ὑπάρχον ἃν ὑπαρχονν ἄν ἐπιμελέσθη τὸ ποιήσαι τοῦτον αὐτήγραφόν καὶ δοθήσων Ἰωανᾶθαν καὶ ταθήσων ἐν τῷ δρεῖ τῷ ἠγίῳ ἐν τότε ἐπισήμωμ 36 καὶ εἶδεν Ἰησοῦς Ἰουδαίων ὃ μεθύσας ἡ γῆ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ καὶ οὖσαν αὐτῷ ἀνθισθείης καὶ ἀπέλυσεν πᾶσα τὰς εἰς αὐτὸ ἐκατεστὰς εἰς τῶν ἱερῶν τόπον πλὴν τῶν ἱερῶν δυνάμεων ὃν ἐξενόλογον ἀπὸ τῶν νῆσων τῶν ἔθνων καὶ ἠχθράναν αὐτῷ πάσας αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν πατέρων

18 Whiston’s translation has “Peraea” here, presumably as the result of an attempt to harmonize this passage with Ant. 13.54. No extant manuscript preserves here Peraea as a variant. E (i.e., the Epitome manuscript, used by Zonaras and dated by Niese to the 10th-11th century) preserves the only variant: Ἰονᾶτ. See Flavius Josephus and Benedikt Niese, Flavii Iosephi Opera: edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Benedictus Niese (Berolini: apud Weidmannos, 1887), volume III.
ἀπὸ τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος καὶ τὰ προσκυροῦντα τούτοις, is nearly a word-for-word copy of the version that we have in Rahlf’s edition of 1 Maccabees (see Table 2).
### Demetrius I and Jonathan (ca. 152 BCE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text/Passage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Toparchy/Nome</th>
<th>District Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Macc. 10:30</td>
<td>Letter of Demetrius I to Jonathan</td>
<td>Three <em>nomes</em></td>
<td>From <em>Samaritis</em> and Galilee (ἀπὸ τῆς <em>Σαμαρίτιδος</em> καὶ Γαλιλαίας)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Macc. 10:38</td>
<td>Letter of Demetrius I to Jonathan (cont.)</td>
<td>Three <em>nomes</em></td>
<td>From the <em>χώρα</em> of <em>Samaria</em> (ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας <em>Σαμαρείας</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Antiquities</em> 13.50</td>
<td>Letter of Demetrius I to Jonathan</td>
<td>Three <em>toparchies</em></td>
<td>Of <em>Samaria</em>, Galilee, and Peraea (καὶ τῶν τριῶν τοπαρχιῶν τῶν τῆς Ιουδαίας προσκειμένων <em>Σαμαρείας</em> καὶ Γαλιλαίας καὶ Περαιάς)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Antiquities</em> 13.54</td>
<td>Letter of Demetrius I to Jonathan (cont.)</td>
<td>Three <em>nomes</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demetrius II and Jonathan (ca. 145 BCE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text/Passage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Toparchy/Nome</th>
<th>District Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Macc. 11:28</td>
<td>Jonathan speaking to Demetrius II</td>
<td>Three <em>toparchies</em></td>
<td>And <em>Samaritis</em> (τὰς τρεῖς τοπαρχίας καὶ τὴν <em>Σαμαρίτιν</em> )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Macc. 11:34</td>
<td>Letter of Demetrius II to Jonathan</td>
<td>Three <em>nomes</em></td>
<td>Of Aphairema, Lydda, and Rathama and the parts adjoining them...added from <em>Samaritis</em> (καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς νομοὺς Αφαίρεμα καὶ Λυδᾶ καὶ Ραθάμαι...ἀπὸ τῆς <em>Σαμαρίτιδος</em>...καὶ πάντα τὰ συγκυριότατα αὐτοῖς)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Antiquities</em> 13.125</td>
<td>Jonathan speaking to Demetrius II</td>
<td>Three <em>toparchies</em></td>
<td>Of <em>Samaria</em>, Joppa, and Galilee (καὶ τῶν τριῶν τοπαρχιῶν <em>Σαμαρείας</em> καὶ Ῥώμης καὶ Γαλιλαίας)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Antiquities</em> 13.127</td>
<td>Letter of Demetrius II to Jonathan</td>
<td>Three <em>nomes</em></td>
<td>Aphairema, Lydda, and Ramatha...and things pertaining to them...added from <em>Samaritis</em> (οἷς τρεῖς νομοὶ Ἀφαίρεμα καὶ Λυδᾶ καὶ Ραθάμαι οἱ τῆς Ιουδαίας προστεθηκαίν ἀπὸ τῆς <em>Σαμαρίτιδος</em> καὶ τὰ προσκυριότατα τουτοῖς)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2:** The letters from Demetrius I and Demetrius II to Jonathan, as represented by 1 Maccabees
There are three categories of inconsistency in these letters, all of which are highlighted in Table 2: (1) Shifts in terminology between νόµος and τοπαρχία; (2) shifts in terminology between Σαµαρίτις and Σαµαρεία; and (3) a lack of agreement as to what the proper name designations were for the districts that were annexed to Judaea. At first glance it appears that 1 Maccabees, which was probably composed ca. 100 BCE by a member of the Hasmonaean court who therefore probably had access to originals or copies of these letters,¹ used the terms νόµος and Σαµαρίτις, while Josephus, writing ca. 100 CE when Palestine was under the administrative control of the Romans, used the terms τοπαρχία and Σαµαρεία. Josephus does use νόµος in Ant. 13.54 and 13.127, but he was copying 1 Maccabees and his use of νόµος in Ant. 13.127 is the only Josephan passage (of those being considered here) that is nearly a word-for-word copy of 1 Maccabees 11:34. And the author of 1 Maccabees does appear to use τοπαρχία in 1 Maccabees 11:28, but its presence in the text is likely the result of a later gloss.² This conclusion is further underscored by a quick look at Josephus’ use of τοπαρχία and

¹ The majority opinion is that 1 Maccabees was composed ca. 100 BCE, but Seth Schwartz has argued for dating the composition of 1 Maccabees to ca. 132-128 BCE. See Seth Schwartz, "Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonaean Expansion," JJS 42, no. 1 (1991), 16-38.

² This passage (1 Maccabees 11:28) represents the only instance of τοπαρχία in the entire Septuagint. Its occurrence is most easily and satisfactorily explained as the result of a later gloss that was incorporated into the text. The meaning of the letter is admittedly opaque: how could the three nomenes of Aphairema, Ludda, and Rathama (along with the region bordering them) be added to Judaea from Samaria (ἀπὸ τῆς Σαµαρίτιδος). Not only were the three “nomes” actually toparchies, but Samaritis itself was the equivalent of a nome, so the text seems to be saying that the nome of Samaritis had three nomenes within it. A gloss, then, was inserted (or copied from the margin) to explain what Demetrius’ letter meant without changing the contents of the letter. The Greek of the gloss further suggests this interpretation of events: though English translations have mistranslated the passage as, “Jonathan asked the king to free Judaea and the three districts (toparchies) of Samaria from tribute,” the Greek says that Jonathan asked the king to free Judaea and the three toparchies and Samaria from tribute (καὶ ἐξέσω Ἰωναθαν τὸν βασιλέα ποιήσας τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἀφορολόγησαι καὶ τὰς τρεις τοπαρχίας καὶ τὴν Σαµαρείαν). As for the other places in the Septuagint in which νόµος is used instead of τοπαρχία, it is either an artifact of translation (a text in Hebrew or Aramaic, translated into Greek by an Alexandrian, would most likely preserve the Alexandrian word for “district” (νόµος), or it is a result of the Ptolemies using the nome system throughout their kingdom and Palestine not coming under Seleucid control until 199 BCE (i.e., after most of the books of the Septuagint were translated into Greek).
νόμος. The entities depicted in these letters are stereotypical Josephan τοπαρχία, and, aside from Ant. 13.54 and 13.127, he only uses νόμος with an administrative meaning in five other places, all of which are specific references to the Egyptian nome of Heliopolis.

In addition, most scholars have concluded that the Ptolemies administered at least part of Palestine under the Egyptian nome system, and that the Seleucids continued this practice Seleucids after the battle of Paneas in 199 BCE, in large part due to the evidence of these letters. It is worth considering, however, that if 1 Maccabees was translated into Greek by and Egyptian, as the existence of the Septuagint makes possible (though hardly certain), the use of toparchy in place of nome in 1 Maccabees would have required knowledge of Seleucid administrative practices on the part of a translator, and it would make sense that the translator, encountering a Semitic word for “district,” would have used the designation that made the most sense to him (νόμος).

The more illuminating discrepancy in the letters are the differences in occurrence between Σαµαρίτις and Σαµαρείας. Although there is very little difference between the two words (especially to English-speaking ears that are used to hearing about “Samaritans” who lived in or came from “Samaria”), their forms are quite important. According to the Hebrew Bible, the name “Shomron” (םֹר), from which the English word “Samaria” comes, is apparently the result of the Israelite king Omri’s purchase of a hill from a man named Shemer. Whether or not that is the correct etymology, the

---

4 Ant. 12:388; 13:70; 20:236; War 1:33; 7:426.
5 1Kings 16:24. Note also Josephus’ explanation in Ant. 8:312: “[Omri reigned for 6 years in Tirzah] and the rest in the city called Somareon, which was named Samaria by the Greeks. He himself designated it to be called Somaraios, after Somaros, who sold him the mountain on which he built the city.” (ὁ Ἀμαρίνος έτη δώδεκα τούτων τὰ μὲν έξ ἐν Θάρσῳ πόλει τὰ δὲ λειτὰ ἐν Σωμαραίοις λεγομένη πόλει ἦπο
Hebrew Bible makes it clear that the city of Shomron (שֹׁם־רוֹן) was the capital of the northern kingdom of Israel, and coins from the 4th century BCE and the Wadi ed-Daliyeh papyri show that the city or fortress of Shomron (שֹׁם־רוֹן) was the capital city of a province by the same name (.rarainא שומָרְתִּים) in the Persian period. The name Σαµαρίτις, on the other hand, probably comes from the Ptolemaic administration of the region, as regional names ending with –ιτις are common in areas that were once ruled by the Ptolemies.

It therefore comes as no surprise that Σαµαρίτις occurs only three times in the entire Septuagint (as opposed Σαµαρεία, which occurs 107 times), all of which are in 1 Maccabees, and all of which occur in or associated with the official correspondences under consideration here. These statistics are likely due to the fact that (a) the city of Samaria is referenced far more often in the Hebrew Bible than the district in which it resided; and (b) only the very late books of the Septuagint were written late enough to have any opportunity to make reference to the Ptolemaic district in which the city of Samaria resided, and only the books of Maccabees are of a genre that would have taken

---

6 E.g., 1 Ki. 16:29; 20:1; 21:18; 2 Ki. 3:1; et al.
7 WDSP 4.1; 5.1; 14.9; 19.1; and 26.1. (See Gropp et al., Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh XXVIII, Miscellanea, Part 2.) So also Ezra 4:10: יִרְמֹשֶׁפֶּה יָבִי יִרְמֹשֶׁפֶּה. For the coins, see Ya’akov Meshorer and Shraga Qedar, Samarian Coinage. Publications of the Israel Numismatic Society: Numismatic Studies and Researches (Jerusalem: Israel Numismatic Society, 1999). The papyri are not pointed, so the vowels are questionable. In the Hebrew Bible it is consistently שומָרְתִּים in Hebrew and שומָרְתִּים in Aramaic (Ezra 4:10; 4:17). Though the gametz followed by a sheva in the Aramaic suggests a long “o” vowel, the Canaanite shift suggests reading it as a long “a” vowel, which probably explains the aleph in the Greek. The Targumim are interesting in that they consistently point the word according to the Hebrew pronunciation: שומָרְתִּים and שומָרְתִּים (e.g., 1 Ki. 13:32 and 1 Ki. 16:32), as also the Peshitta’s consistent שומָרְתִּים (e.g., Luke 17:11; John 4:4, 9; Acts 1:8; 8:1, 5, 9, 14; 15:3), though note the curious and unique instance of שומָרְתִּים in the list of “Judaea, Galilee, and Samaria” in Acts 9:31.
9 1 Macc. 10:30; 11:28, 34. Σαµαρεία occurs twice in 1 Maccabees: 1 Macc. 3:10; 10:38, both of which probably refer to the city of Samaria, even if somewhat circumlocutiously.
note of or made reference to such administrative details. Josephus’ use of the terms is slightly inconsistent, as Josephus is often wont to be. For the most part, however, he follows the same pattern. He consistently uses Σαµαρίτις as a reference to the region, including in the sections in which he explicitly delineates and describes the regions of Galilee, Judaea, and Σαµαρείτις,10 and nearly all of the 105 occurrences of the word Σαµαρεία reflect the explicit or implicit designation of a city.11 The exception to this rule is when Σαµαρεία is preceded by forms of the words κοίλη or χώρα, as in War 1.213, 302; Ant. 12.154, 175; and 14.411.

Once these nuances inherent in the words Σαµαρεία and Σαµαρ(ε)ίτις are understood, the letters from Demetrius I and Demetrius II to Jonathan begin to make sense. The toparchy of Samaria (i.e., a small administrative unit named according to its “capital” city) that will be added to Judaea in Ant. 13:50 and 13.125 is referred to by the name Σαµαρεία, while the region or district of Σαµαρ(ε)ίτις out of which a toparchy or nome is to be added to Judaea is referred to by the name Σαµαρ(ε)ίτις (1 Macc. 10:30, 11:34, and Ant. 13.127). The only exception is 1 Macc. 10:38, in which three nomes are being added to Judaea from the χώρα of Σαµαρεία. As noted above in the discussion of Josephus’ use of Σαµαρεία, this construction ought to be rendered along the lines of “from the vicinity (of the city of) Samaria” or “from the hinterland (of the city of)

10 War 3.37, 48. The only exception is in Ant. 7.103, where Josephus is citing Nicolaus of Damascus as saying that Herod “made an expedition against the Jews and laid waste to the city that is now called Samareitis.”

11 Notable among these instances is Ant. 9.278-9, in which Josephus writes that Shalmaneser besieged the city of Samaria for 3 years, took it, and took the Israelites to Media and Persia. He then replaced them by moving people from Kutha “into Samaria and into the country of the Israelites” (εἰς τὴν Σαµάρειαν καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἰσραήλιτῶν χώραν). There are five exceptions: War 2.247 (which is set in the time of, and may reflect the reality of, the Roman administration of the region), Ant. 11.21, 167; 12.224; and 20.118 (in which the village of Ginea is described as lying on the border of Σαµαρεία, even though the same village had been described in War 3.48 as marking the border between Galilee and Σαµαρείτις).
Samaria.” This usage of χώρα is consistent not only with Josephus’, but can also be found elsewhere in 1 Maccabees\(^\text{12}\) and the later books of the Septuagint.\(^\text{13}\)

Within the framework that has been supplied by the foregoing discussion of the linguistics of these passages we can now turn to the question of exactly what was added to Judaea by Demetrius I. Let us first look to the the internal logic and cohesion of the earliest preserved copy of the first letter, that of Demetrius I, as recorded in 1 Maccabees. The letter begins with a typical greeting formula before foreshadowing its structure in 10:27-28: “Now continue still to keep faith with us, and we will repay you with good for what you do for us; we will grant you many immunities and give you gifts.”\(^\text{14}\) Verses 29-35 then describe the immunities,\(^\text{15}\) and verses 36-45 describe the gifts.\(^\text{16}\) In other words, structurally speaking, it is verse 38 (καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς νομοὺς τοὺς προστεθέντας τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας Σαμαρείας προστεθήτω τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ πρὸς τὸ λογισθῆναι τοῦ γενέσθαι ύφ᾽ ἕνα τοῦ μὴ ὑπακούσαι ἄλλης ἐξουσίας ἄλλ᾽ ἥ τοῦ ἄρχιερέως), and not verse 30, that is

\(^{12}\) E.g., 1 Macc. 7:7 (the χώρα of the king) and 12:32 (the χώρα of Damascus), as well as in many places denoting the “land of Israel” with a clear indication of borders and Jewish authority within those borders. See also 1 Esd. 5:45; 8:13; 9:37. Ezra 7:16, et al. Esth. 4:3 and Neh. 1:3 should also be added to this list, for although they don’t explicitly mention a referent, it can be deduced from the context.

\(^{13}\) καὶ οὖν ἐμείητε ἐπὶ τῷ συντηρῆσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς πίστιν καὶ ἀνταποδώσωμεν ἵμιν ἀγαθὰ ἀνθ᾽ ὧν τούτες μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ἴμιν ἀφῆσομεν ἵμιν ἀφέματα πολλὰ καὶ ὀδύσομεν ἵμιν ὀδύματα.

\(^{14}\) Immunities: exemption from tribute, salt tax, crown levies; exemption from the tax of one-third of yearly grain and one-half of the yearly fruit for the land of Judah and the 3 nemes being added to it from Samaritis and Galilee – “[which is to say], Jerusalem and its environs, its tithes and its revenues, shall be holy and free from tax; release of control of the citadel; release of Jewish captives within Demetrius’ kingdom; exemption of tax on captives’ livestock; freedom form work for Judeans on festivals, Sabbaths, new moons, appointed days, and for three days before and after a festival; and freedom from the obligation to provide for the military.

\(^{15}\) Gifts: up to 30,000 Judeans can be in the army, they will be put into positions of power, and they will be commanded by Judeans; 3 nemes will be annexed to Judaea from the χώρα of Samaria and they will be considered to be under one ruler and will obey no other authority than the high priest in Jerusalem; Acco-Ptolemais and its surrounding land have also been given to Jerusalem, to meet the expenses of the temple; the king will pay 15,000 shekels per year, as well as additional funds for the service of the temple; the 5,000 shekels of silver that have in the past been paid to Seleucid officials will now go to the priests in the temple; anybody who takes refuge in the temple because of money owed to the king will be released; the king will pay for the rebuilding and restoring of the temple, the walls in Jerusalem, and the walls in Judaea.
the description of the gift. This conclusion corresponds well with the earlier discussion of 1 Maccabees’ use of Σαµαρεία and Σαµαρίτις: not only does the structure of 1 Maccabees argue for 10:34 as the more reliable of the two passages, but also 10:34 should be preferred because it is more specific: the nomes are to be added from the χώρα of [the city of] Samaria.

Next let us look to the section of the letters for which there is the greatest amount of agreement among the ancient authors, namely 1 Macc. 11:34 and Ant. 13.127. The fact that Josephus paraphrased 1 Maccabees’ presentation of the events leading up to the letter from Demetrius II to Jonathan, and paraphrased the last portion of the letter as well, but that Josephus’ version of the first portion of that letter is an almost identical copy of the letter preserved in the Septuagint, suggests that Josephus is either copying 1 Maccabees or that both 1 Maccabees and Josephus are copying another text (i.e., the text of this letter that was apparently placed “in a conspicuous place on the holy mountain” – see 1 Maccabees 11:37). It is more likely to have been the former, given that Josephus was writing from Rome and that he returned to paraphrasing before the letter ends and the possibility (if not the likelihood) that the letter would have been originally written in Greek and erected near the Temple in that language, rather than being translated to Hebrew or Aramaic.\(^\text{17}\) That said, we must not forget that 1 Maccabees was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic and only later translated into Greek. The differences

\(^\text{17}\) The so called “Temple Warning Inscription” from the Temple Mount that prohibited non-Jews from entering into an area of the temple precincts (likely dating to the Herodian period) was in Greek precisely because it was aimed at foreigners. On the other hand, the Theodotus dedicatory inscription was also in Greek, and there is no good reason to think that educated, literate Jews would not have spoken Greek in the Herodian period or even the early first century CE, even if the linguistic picture for the Hasmonaean period is far murkier than for the Herodian period. It is possible that engraving the letter in Greek would project its status as a letter from the Seleucid king; or we could point to the original Semitic language of 1 Maccabees – an official Hasmonaean court document – as evidence for the use and/or importance of the language in the Jerusalem aristocracy and government around 100 BCE.
between 1 Maccabees’ and Josephus’ versions of the letter could well be the result of one or both translation events.

Whatever the case, the close agreement between 1 Maccabees and Josephus, plus the suggestion in the letter that it was inscribed and placed in public, require us to prefer the first part of the letter as the most authoritative text on the matter and to understand the additions to Judaea to have been the cities of Aphairema, Ludda, and either Ramatha or Rathama, plus their hinterlands. Josephus’ statement in Ant. 13.125 (three lines prior to his statement that the cities were Aphairema, Ludda, and Ramatha) that Demetrius II annexed the three toparchies of Samaritis, Joppa, and Galilee, which parallels his statement in Ant. 13.50 that Demetrius I annexed the toparchies of Samaria, Galilee, and Peraea, is admittedly a problem. Although Josephus has been accused of sloppy work, this seems unbelievable, and there are no textual variants that might explain the text that we have before us. However, it might be possible to explain his quick shift here, as well as his additions of Galilee and Peraea elsewhere, in addition to his apparent changing of 1 Maccabees’ Ραθαμιν to Ραμαθην. Αφαιρεμα is not mentioned elsewhere in Josephus, but it can be found in Joshua codex A (19:17) where it is listed as a city in the tribal allotment of Issachar, in lower Galilee; Lydda is well represented elsewhere in Josephus as a town of Samaritans that was well known to have been given to Judaea; and in Ant. 8.411 Josephus mentions a Ραμαθην that is a city of 9th century BCE Gilead, across the Jordan from Judaea (i.e., Ramoth Gilead, which would have been in the region of the

---

18 So also Schwartz, though he comes to a much different conclusion. See Schwartz, “The ‘Judaism’ of Samaria and Galilee in Josephus’s Version of the Letter of Demetrius I to Jonathan (Antiquities 13.48-57).”
19 There is one witness each to the textual variants Ραμαθημιν (l62), Ραμαθιμιν (L), ramath(a)e (La13), ramath (La3); and קַרְתְּנָה (Sy1). All other other manuscripts have a variant of Ραθαμιν: Ραθμιν(ε)ν (A,S,V,q, 62, 46,55, 58, 106, 311); Ραθμινα την αυτον (i.e., Ραθα>μιν αυτον – 340. Note that αυτον is added to the text by L’, 58, 311, LaBv, and Sy3);
Decapolis in the Roman period, just north of the “border” between the Decapolis and Peraea). It is true that the change from Ἐφέσου to Ἐφαιτον could simply be the result of metathesis in the historical transmission of this document, but if it were intentional (or even a mistake of metathesis on the part of Josephus prior to writing), and if Josephus did not know exactly where the city had stood, Ant. 13.125 could be read with a partitive genitive: “[Jonathan] petitioned [Demetrius] that he would give him 300 talents for all of Judaea and the three toparchies, [one of which is in] Samaria, [one of which is in] Peraea, and [one of which is in] Galilee.”21 This is not to say that Josephus’ paraphrase of Ant. 13.125 is more reliable than the beginning of Demetrius I’s letter, but simply one explanation that gives an internal logic to Josephus’ writing (as opposed to an explanation that requires us to throw the passage out with no explanation). Indeed, if this interpretation is correct, it shows Josephus to be doing what he can be seen to do elsewhere, namely, using a historical document to say what he wants his audience to hear about the Jews.

Whatever the case, the fact that (a) this letter, and this letter only, was apparently erected in public in Jerusalem; (b) Josephus is paraphrasing 1 Maccabees in Ant. 13.125 but is almost word-for-word in 13.127; (c) that the list of “Samaria, Joppa, and Galilee” in 13.125 neither makes geographical sense nor does it make sense of Josephus’ conceptualization of τοπαρχία (see above), but “Aphairema, Lydda, and Ramatha/Rathama” do;22 and (d) that Josephus preserved 1 Maccabees’ νομοῦς here – a

---

21 It is worth noting here that Josephus would have known that his audience would not have known where Aphairema, Lydda, and Ramatha were. It is possible that simply expected his readers to assume that one city was in each region.
22 As far as Josephus’ designation of the three regions as being Samaria, Joppa (or Peraea), and Galilee goes, there are a variety of possible explanations. Two likely ones are that Josephus added Galilee and Peraea to 1 Maccabees’ mention of Samaria because both were regions that shared a border with Samaria and both were given to Herod Antipas after Herod the Great’s kingdom was broken up (Ant 17.185, 276;
word that he only ever used with this meaning of the Egyptian nome of Hieropolis (see above) all point to the conclusion that this text is the earliest and most reliable source on the matter, and consequently that the districts added to Judaea were Aphairema, Lydda, and Ramatha. This makes good topographical sense, too. Rather than imagining districts being added to Judaea that were physically disconnected from it (if we understand the situation to have been “three toparchies from Samaria and Galilee,” for instance), or such huge sections of Palestine being added to Judaea that they would have more than tripled its size (if we understand the situation to have been the addition of Samaria, Galilee, and Peraea, which anyway would have been hyparchies or eparchies, but not toparchies), we find the addition of small districts consisting of a city and its hinterland on Judaea’s northern border: most scholars have concluded that that Aphairema was just north of Bethel, Ramathaim was east of Joppa, and Lydda was southeast of Joppa (see Figure 1).

Given the conclusions that 1 Maccabees 11:34 is the most reliable text on the matter and that 1 Maccabees 10:38 is the most specific description within the letter of Demetrius I to Jonathan of the regions that were being added to Judaea, it is clear that the presence of Γαλιλαία in 1 Macc. 10/ Ant. 13.48-57 must be explained away. There are two possibilities that make the most sense: either the letter from Demetrius I to Jonathan as a whole is saying that three nomes are being added to Judah from an administrative district called Samaritis-and-Galilee or the addition of Γαλιλαίας to verse 30 is a later addition

---

18.240), or that Josephus added Galilee and Peraea because they had concentrations of Jews in his day (so Schwartz, "The 'Judaism' of Samaria and Galilee in Josephus's Version of the Letter of Demetrius I to Jonathan (Antiquities 13.48-57)."

to the text (perhaps an addition that occurred in the 200 or so years between the composition of 1 Maccabees and the composition of Antiquities, which could explain Josephus’ addition of Peraea to a version of 1 Maccabees that read ...τὸν τριῶν τοπαρχιῶν τὸν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ προσκειμένων Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας...). 24

The former explanation, while tidy, has little support: to my knowledge, 1 Maccabees 10:30 preserves the only known evidence for such a name of this well-known administrative district. The latter explanation is simply not very satisfying. On the other hand, these letters in 1 Maccabees preserve what is to my knowledge the only evidence for the widespread scholarly conclusion that the Ptolemies imposed the Egyptian nome system in its administration of regions outside of Egypt, and this would be neither the first nor the last time that a later addition has been argued to have made its way into the text. The number of textual variants for any given ancient text might, in and of

---

24 Most scholars have explained Ant. 13.50 in this way, suggesting that he chose to supply Peraea because he knew that Judaea, Samaria, Galilee, and Peraea were the places where the vast majority of Palestinian Jews lived in his day (and, perhaps, figured that this was the historical reason for it). It is clear that this was Josephus’ concept of the cultural landscape: see, for instance, War 3.35–58, in which the physical landscape of Galilee, Peraea, Samaria, and Judaea is inserted his story of Vespasian and Titus entering the region to make war against the Jews. Although he says that he has “described the country of Judaea and those that lie around it,” (τὰ μὲν δὴ περὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας τε καὶ πέρι τῶν χώρας ὡς ἐνή μᾶλλον συντόμως ἀπεγγέλκομεν), in fact he has neglected Idumaea and the coast. However, this explanation does not that fact does not provide a good reason for Josephus’ use of the word τοπαρχία. If Josephus meant to use both the word τοπαρχία and the names Samaria, Galilee, and Peraea, then Ant. 13.50 and 13.125 would be the only two places in all of his works in which τοπαρχία does not mean “a city and its hinterland.” There are 21 occurrences: Ant. 8.35 (Bethlehem), 284 (Bethel and Jeshanah); 13.50 (Samaris and Galilee?!), 102 (Ekron), 125 (Samaria and Joppa and Galilee?!); 18.31 (Jamnia and perhaps, although elided, Thamnia and Bethlephom), 235 (Acrabatene), 252 (Abila, Julius in Peraea, Tarichea, and Tiberias in Galilee), 509 (Narbatae), 567 (Thamnia and perhaps, although elided, Lydda, Joppa, and Emmaus), 652 (Acrabatene); 3.48 (Acrabatene), 54 (the toarchic cities of Judaea: Gophna, Acrebatan, Thamna, Lydda, Emmaus, Pella, Idumaea, Engedi, Herodium, Jericho, Jamnia, Joppa); 4.44f. (Thamnia and Bethlephom, and perhaps, although elided, Lydda and Jamnia), 504 (Acrabatene), 511 (Acrabatene), 551 (Gophna and Acrabatana).
themselves, suggest that this is the more likely explanation, however great a cop-out it might seem.

Alexander Jannaeus in Galilee (ca. 125 BCE)

Even if the letters of Demetrius I and Demetrius II do not contain any evidence that the Seleucids put all or part of Galilee under Hasmonaean control, we must also consider Josephus’ story that Alexander Jannaeus was banished to Galilee by his father when he was a child (Ant. 13.320-322). However, Bar-Kochva rightly notes that it simply cannot be taken as evidence of any dense Jewish settlement in the region, as has often been the case. Josephus’ account is both fantastical and likely based on Nicolaus of Damascus’ writings that sought to denigrate the Hasmonaeans in support of Herod the Great (who was Idumaean and whose power came as a result of the demise of Hasmonaean control):25

When Aristobulus was dead, his wife Salome, who, by the Greeks, was called Alexandra, let his brethren out of prison, (for Aristobulus had kept them in bonds, as we have said already,) and made Alexander Jannaeus king, who was the superior in age and in moderation. This child happened to be hated by his father as soon as he was born, and could never be permitted to come into his father's sight till he died. The occasion of which hatred is thus reported: When Hyrkanus chiefly loved the two oldest of his sons, Antigonus and Aristobulus, God appeared to him in his sleep, of whom he inquired which of his sons should be his successor. Upon God's showing him the countenance of Alexander, he was grieved that he was to be the heir of all his goods, and allowed him to be brought up in Galilee. However, God did not deceive Hyrkanus…26

---

26 Τελευτήσαντος δὲ Ἀριστοβούλου Σαλίνα ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ λεγομένη δὲ ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων Ἀλεξάνδρα λύσασα τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ ἀδελφούς γὰρ αὐτοῖς εἶχεν Ἀριστοβούλος ὡς προειρήκαμεν Ἰαναῖον τὸν καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον βασιλεὰ καθίστριν τὸν καὶ καθ’ ἀληθίαν ἀφύγοντα καὶ μετριώτατα ὁτ’ καὶ συνέβη γεννήθηνει εὐθὺς μισηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μέχρι τῆς τελευτής αὐτοῦ μηκέτι εἰς δίπλαν ἀφικόσθαι τὸ ὁ αἵτινος τοῦ μίσους τοῦ ἠνόητος γενέσθαι στέργων μάλιστα τῶν παῖδων Ἡρκανίου τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις Ἀντιγόνοι καὶ Ἀριστοβουλοῦ φανέρα κατὰ τοὺς ὑπὸς αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰαναῖον ἐπηρωτα τις αὐτὸς τῶν παῖδων μέλλει ἐσεθῆσαι διάδοχος τοῦ ὁ δὲ θεός τοὺς τοῦτον χαρακτήρας δείχνοντας λυπηθεὶς ὅτι τῶν ἠγαθῶν αὐτοῦ πάντων οὕτως ἔσται κληρονόμος γενόμενοι καὶ εἰσεν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ τρέφονται ὁ μένι τὸ θεὸς οὗ διεφεύσατο τὸν Ἡρκανίου
It is well known that one of Josephus’ primary sources on the Herodian period was Nicolaus of Damascus, who is widely regarded as having been a prolific anti-Hasmonaean author who has been seen by most if not all scholars as being engaged in a campaign of sorts to denigrate Jannaeus’ image. It has also been argued that this story was inspired by the Oedipus myth (cf. also Herodotus, 1.107). It is also not clear how it would be possible that Hyrcanus could have already preferred the two oldest of “all his sons” before Jannaeus was born, seen Alexander Jannaeus’ χαρακτήρ in his dream, been advised that the latter would be his successor and regretted it to the extent of banishing the infant immediately after his birth,\(^{27}\) and it is at least possible that this passage is Nicolaus implying that even Jannaeus’ father hated him and tried to get rid of him at all costs. Even if not, those who attribute some validity to the story must admit that Galilee was regarded as a desolate place (and this was certainly Nicolaus’ meaning) and not as a flourishing and dense concentration of Jewish population.\(^{28}\) Furthermore, it is hard to imagine that the son of a king (even a hated one) actually having been sent to a desolate place, especially one outside of Hasmonaean control (unless he was a hostage, but there is no suggestion of that here).

Furthermore, if 1 Macc. 5:9-54 is to be believed, it would seem that there were few, if any, Jews left in the Galilee before Judas’ rescue mission around 164 BCE (and

---


few, if any, afterwards).\textsuperscript{29} Those who conclude that the majority of the inhabitants of the Galilee in this period were Jewish usually dismiss the expression “Galilee of the Gentiles” in 1 Macc. 5:15 as merely a biblical phrase (Isa. 9:1).\textsuperscript{30} But this will not do – not least because it does not make sense during the time of John Hyrcanus’ reign, which is when the book was likely written. If the Galilee was inhabited by a Jewish majority at this time, what would be the point of the author of 1 Maccabees disqualifying “historic” claims of Jewish rights to the region when John Hyrcanus’ expansion was just getting underway (1 Macc. 15:33-34), unless it was an accurate depiction of the region as a whole?\textsuperscript{31}

I am not arguing here that there were no Jews in Galilee in 125 BCE, but rather that (a) there are at least serious problems with Josephus’ story in \textit{Ant}. 13.320-322, if not enough evidence to consider it entirely fallacious, and (b) there certainly is not enough evidence to conclude on the basis of this passage alone that there was a flourishing Jewish population in Galilee at this time – especially not one that was administered from

\textsuperscript{29} Josephus’ version of this story in \textit{Ant}. 12.334, in which he says that only the Jews who were rescued from captivity were evacuated from Judaea, would be a happy medium that would allow 1 Maccabees to be correct \textit{and} leave Jews in Galilee. However, Bar-Kochva rightly notes that it can only be understood as an unsuccessful paraphrase of 1 Maccabees because there is no evidence that Josephus had any other source for his knowledge of the campaigns of Judas. Furthermore, Josephus’ version of Hasmonean events between 167-135 BCE is almost entirely paraphrased (often with anachronistic Roman-period interpolations). See Bar-Kochva, “Manpower, Economics and Internal Strife in the Hasmonean State,” in \textit{Armées et fiscalité dans le monde antique: Actes du colloque national, Paris, 14-16 Octobre 1976}, 193 n. 193.

\textsuperscript{30} 1 Macc. 5:1-15: “When the Gentiles all around heard that the altar had been rebuilt and the sanctuary dedicated as it was before, they became very angry, and they determined to destroy the descendants of Jacob who lived among them. So they began to kill and destroy among the people …Messengers, with their garments torn, came [to Judas and his brothers] from Galilee and…said that the people of Ptolemais and Tyre and Sidon, and all Galilee of the Gentiles had gathered together against them ‘to annihilate us.’”

\textsuperscript{31} Bar-Kochva, “Manpower, Economics and Internal Strife in the Hasmonean State,” in \textit{Armées et fiscalité dans le monde antique: Actes du colloque national, Paris, 14-16 Octobre 1976}, 192-193. 1 Macc. 15:33-34 reads, “Simon said to [Athenobius, Friend of Antiochus] in reply: “We have neither taken foreign land nor seized foreign property, but only the inheritance of our ancestors, which at one time had been unjustly taken by our enemies. \textsuperscript{34} Now that we have the opportunity, we are firmly holding the inheritance of our ancestors.” (καὶ ἀποκριθές τὴν Σιμών ἐπεί οὗτος οὐδὲ γῆν ἀλλοτρίων εἰλήφαμεν οὗτε ἀλλοτρίων κεκρατήκαμεν ἀλλὰ τῆς κληρονομίας τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ὑπὸ ὑπὸ ἕχορῷ ἡμῶν άξιότος ἐν τινι καὶ τρίτῃ κατεκρατήθη ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐχοντες ἀντεχόμεθα τῆς κληρονομίας τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν)”
Jerusalem. Furthermore, there is no reason to think that anything other than Lower Galilee is envisioned here, and as was seen in Chapter 2, there was a vast difference between Upper and Lower Galilee in the Hellenistic period. As a result, any evidence that this passage might lend to an argument for significant Jewish presence by 125 BCE, it would still be well south of Kedesh.

1 Maccabees’ Presentation of Jonathan’s Settlement Practices

Although 1 Maccabees and Josephus do not present a case for annexation or political control of the Galilee, it does not preclude the possibility that the Hasmonaeans settled people there. 1 Maccabees clearly presents various Hasmonaean rulers settling Judaeans in conquered cities; is it possible that the Squatters at Tel Kedesh are evidence of such practices?

The similarities between 1 Maccabees and biblical histories, especially the Former Prophets (תנאים – Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings) are so obvious that there is universal scholarly consensus that the author of 1 Maccabees intentionally imitated them. The author of 1 Maccabees uses citations from the Bible and makes indirect references to Biblical passages (this phenomenon is not limited to the Former Prophets), he uses Biblical idioms and phrases, and he imitates Biblical prototypes. For example, in 1 Macc. 2:26 Mattathias is presented as an analog to Phineas, the grandson of Aaron and a high priest known for his zealous attack against heresy (Num. 24-25).

---


33 1 Macc. 2:26: “Thus he burned with zeal for the law, just as Phinehas did against Zimri son of Salu.” For this and the following parallels (as well as many more), see Goldstein, *I Maccabees: A New Translation, With Introduction and Commentary*. 
the presentation goes further than simply comparing Mattathias to Phineas and describing the Maccabean revolt as the result of Mattathias’ “burning with zeal and…giving vent to righteous anger.” The story of Mattahias actually follows the model of Phineas: both are depicted as arising during a time of God’s wrath against Israel, and God’s wrath ceases as a result of Phineas’ and Mattathias’ actions (Num. 25:3; 1 Macc. 1:63-2:1). There are also parallels between the story of Mattathias and the spies Joshua and Caleb. In Numbers 13-14 Israel is rebellious (“…do not rebel against the Lord” – ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου μὴ ἀποστάσατε) but Caleb and Joshua are loyal. In 1 Maccabees Mattathias rebels against the enforced non-Jewish religion, and he and his family remain loyal:

“Even if all the nations that live under the rule of the king obey him, and have chosen to obey his commandments, everyone of them abandoning the religion of their ancestors [ἀποστῆναι ἐκαστὸς ἀπὸ λατρείας πατέρων αὐτοῦ], I and my sons and my brothers will continue to live by the covenant of our ancestors. Far be it from us to desert the law and the ordinances. We will not obey the king’s words by turning aside from our religion to the right hand or to the left.” (1 Macc. 2:19)

Mattathias then flees to the hills in language similar to Biblical descriptions of David.34 When he dies, Mattathias is compared to Abraham, Joseph, Phineas, Joshua, Caleb, David, Elijah, and Daniel in his farewell address.35 Such parallels are not confined to Mattathias. Judas and Jonathan are described as judges of Israel in the Biblical tradition, and the author of 1 Maccabees regularly borrows language from Samuel and Chronicles to describe Judas’ great deeds in the same terms as the feats of Saul, Jonathan, and especially David.36

34 1 Macc. 2:27-28, 42-43; 1 Sam. 22:1-2; 23:14
35 1 Macc 4:60-5: 68. For a more full discussion of these examples and themes, see Goldstein, I Maccabees: A New Translation, With Introduction and Commentary.
36 Judas: Judges 3:30; 1 Macc. 7:50; Jonathan: Judges 10:9, 11:6; 1 Macc. 9:23, 29, 73.
The use of the Former Prophets’ language extends also to descriptions of the Jews and where they live. Throughout Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and 1 Maccabees the word “Israel” is often shorthand for (or in apposition to) “the people” (יִשְׂרָאֵל/τὸν ὄνομαν). But when 1 Maccabees is placed within its proper historical context, the presence of “Israel” is strange. Historically, “Israel” meant something very different in the time of the united monarchy than it did after the kingdom split in the time of Rehoboam (end of the 10th century BCE), when “Israel” came to designate the “Northern Kingdom,” as opposed to “Judah” in the south. This existential reality of divided kingdoms lasted for approximately 200 years before Tiglath-Pileser III destroyed the Northern Kingdom of Israel in 723 BCE. “Judah” continued to exist as a political and geographical entity until 586 BCE, when Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem and exiled many of its inhabitants. After 586 BCE, the only people who used a name from the root יִשָּׂרָאֵל were the Samaritans, who called themselves “Israelites,” as we know from from the 4th century BCE Wadi ed-Daliyah papyri, coins from the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and even in the Samaritan Chronicles of the 6th-10th centuries CE. So the official court history of the Hasmonaean dynasty used a word for “his” people – people that both called themselves

---

37 See the entirety of Meshorer and Qedar, Samarian Coinage.
“Judaeans” and were called “Judaeans” by the nations around them – that (a) in his own time was the self-designation of an “other” people who lived outside his peoples’ borders and who worshiped Yahweh at Mt. Gerizim instead of Jerusalem and (b) that prior to his time had a 450 year-long meaning for “the Northern Kingdom,” expressly distinct from Judah, that had its capital in Samaria. The ideological reasons for using this word are easy to imagine (as is the possibility that it was being used expressly in opposition to the Samaritans, who were politically and ideologically threatening enough that John Hyrcanus destroyed the city of Samaria and the temple at Mt. Gerizim in 113-110 BCE). However, in practical reality it is strange, all the moreso because, according to the author of 1 Maccabees, “Israel” lived in “Judah/Judaea.”

The extent of 1 Maccabees’ use of “Israel” is worth dwelling on for a moment because it has important implications for understanding the veracity of 1 Maccabees’ representation of Hasmonaean expansion vis à vis the author’s conception of what “Israel’s” God-given borders ought to be. It is no surprise that the author of 1 Maccabees would compare the Maccabees to Phineas, Joshua, David, and others in order to describe them as leaders of Israel. Generally speaking, it is clear that “Israel” means “the Jews” as an ἐθνός (that is, both “a people” and “a nation”) who are loved and protected by God, and who are led by the “chosen” Hasmonaean. It is not an abstract, disembodied entity, either. Although Ἰσραήλ is grammatically feminine singular, it is consistently followed by 3rd person plural prepositions (“their,” “they,” “those,” etc.) in 1 Maccabees. God is

---


40 E.g., the mourning cry “of Israel” over the death of Judas in 1 Macc. 9:21: “‘How is the mighty fallen, savior of Israel!’”

41 E.g., 1 Macc. 5:62: “[Joseph and Azariah] did not belong to the family of those men through whom deliverance was given to Israel.”
the “savior of Israel” who performs mighty deeds through the people of Israel, for instance when he is asked to “hem in this army by the hand of your people Israel” (1 Macc. 4.30-31). Antiochus IV is presented as having come to Jerusalem with a large force and “destroying many people of Israel” (1 Macc. 1.30). His officers “kept using violence against Israel” (1 Macc. 1.58), but “many in Israel stood firm and were resolved in their hearts not to eat unclean food” (1 Macc. 1.62). When the Hasideans joined the Maccabees early in the revolt, they are described as “mighty warriors of Israel” (1 Macc. 2.42). In a few places “Israel” is best translated in English as “Israelites,” which further highlights the breadth and depth of 1 Maccabee’s definition of the word – for instance when “the Gentiles in Gilead gathered together against the Israelites who lived in their territory, and planned to destroy them” (1 Macc. 5.9). And when each of the Hasmonean rulers died, “all Israel mourned for him with great lamentation.”

However, “Israel” does not designate “all Jews” but rather “true Jews” – that is, supporters of the Hasmonean regime. Thus in 1 Macc. 6.18-21, the “men in the citadel” who have been “hemming Israel in around the sanctuary” are joined by the “ungodly of Israel” when they go to Antiochus to request reinforcements to stop the Hasmoneans. Likewise, the evil (i.e., “ungodly” – ἅσεβής) Alcimus, who wants to replace Jonathan as high priest, leads “all the lawless and ungodly men of Israel” to Demetrius in an attempt to get him to overthrow the Hasmoneans (1 Macc. 7:5).

It is worth noting that the author of 1 Maccabees uses the Greek words Ἰουδαῖοι (“Judaeans”) and Ἰουδαία (“Judaea”) as well, but where “Israel” is clearly used with the biblical histories in mind, Ἰουδαῖοι and Ἰουδαία are practical terms and Ἰουδαῖοι is not a

---

42 Mattathias: 1 Macc. 2.70; Judas: 1 Macc. 9.20 [note that he is also called “the savior of Israel,” a quote from 2 Sam. 1:19]; Jonathan: 1 Macc. 13.26.
strictly interchangeable synonym for “Israel.” Rather, Ἰουδαῖοι is only ever used in reference to “Israel” when non-Judaeans are speaking (in diplomatic letters, treaties, etc.), and by Judaeans themselves in official domestic documents. So, for instance, we find that the Romans and the Spartans write not to “The Israelites” or “The Nation of Israel,” but to the “Judaeans” (Ἰουδαῖοι). The difference serves to further elucidate the point: to the Seleucids (or the Ptolemies, or the Spartans, or the Romans), the people who live in the region called “Judaea” are “Judaeans,” not “Israelites,” in the same way that the people who live in Syria are “Syrians” and those who live in Alexandria are “Alexandrians.”

In like fashion, “Judah” (or “Judaea”) is always a place in 1 Maccabees. It is the toparchy in which Jerusalem is the main city and, as mentioned above, it is also the place where “Israel” resides. So we find, over and over, references to “the cities of Judah,” “the towns of Judah,” “Jerusalem and the towns of Judah,” “the men of Judah,” “the residents of Judah and Jerusalem,” and, most importantly, “the borders of Judaea” and “the land of Judah,” which is the place that Seleucid kings go when they “invade Judaea.” In other words, “Judah” and “Judaea” are always terms used of a physical locale in 1 Maccabees, and that locale is the place in which “Israel” lives.

---

43 One interesting exception that proves the rule is 1 Macc. 11:45ff. Demetrius’ troops have revolted and he appeals to Jonathan for help. When the people of Antioch also revolt and take to the streets, the author of 1 Maccabees writes that “the king called the Judaeans to his aid, and they rallied around him... When the people saw that the Judaeans had gained control of the city as they pleased, their courage failed and they cried out to the king... And the Judaeans gained glory in the sight of the king and all of the people in his kingdom and they returned to Jerusalem with a large amount of spoil.”

44 There is an almost equal use of the terms (27 occurrences of “Judah” and 26 of “Judaea”).


46 Towns or villages of Judah: 1 Macc. 1:54. Towns or villages of Judaea: 1 Macc. 7:46; 14:33.

47 Jerusalem and the towns of Judah: 1 Macc. 1:44.


All of this exploration into the language of 1 Maccabees becomes important for questions related to Hasmonaean expansion when it is placed into a conversation with observations about historiography. 1 Maccabees is a court history that is not simply attempting to tell the story of the Maccabean revolt and Maccabean rule;\(^{51}\) it is doing so in terms that essentially present them as messiah figures on par with the greatest Israelite leaders who ever lived. Given that Judas and his brothers are presented in terms of biblical figures like Joshua or David, and their deeds as reminiscences of biblical histories, we might expect to find them restoring “Israel” (as opposed to “the Judaeans”) to its God-given, biblical borders – all the more so because so many other historians and authors of the time did exactly this.\(^{52}\)

But, surprisingly, this is precisely what we do not find in 1 Maccabees. Rather, “Israel” resides in Judaea, and only in Judaea. It is as though the author of 1 Maccabees, in spite of all of his biblical knowledge, does not know that God promised “Israel” more land than the Seleucid region of Judaea; or it is as though the Maccabees never expanded their borders to those extents. The stories in 1 Macc. 5 record the Maccabees rescuing the Jews from the persecutions of the Gentiles...and bringing them back to Judaea, not conquering the regions, settling Jews, and resurrecting biblical Israel. When Jonathan is led to his death at Ptolemais by Trypho, he first leaves 2,000 soldiers in Galilee (1 Macc. 12:46ff). When they find out that he and the 1,000 soldiers with him have been killed,

---

\(^{51}\) Here I use the term “Maccabean” to refer to Mattathias and his sons. The history that is 1 Maccabees stops when the last of Mattathias’ sons dies. This may be intentional (note the reference to the chronicles of the high priesthood of John Hyrcanus in the last verse of 1 Maccabees), or it may simply be due to a chronographical vagary, namely that 1 Maccabees was written shortly after Simon died.

\(^{52}\) It has been argued that Josephus often has a very nationalistic geography (especially in *Antiquities*), and that Ben Sira, Jubilees, and the Genesis Apocryphon have Israel’s divinely-promised borders in mind. See, e.g., Ben Sira 44:21, Jubilees 10:29, and Ben-Zion Rosenfeld, "Flavius Josephus and His Portrayal of the Coast (Paralia) of Contemporary Roman Palestine: Geography and Ideology," *JQR* 91, no. 1-2 (2000), 143-183.
they flee back to Judaea. Not only did they clearly have no reinforcements north of Judaea, but the author of 1 Maccabees wrote that they were pursued and “all reached the land of Judah safely.” The clear implication is that only when they reached the borders of Seleucid Judaea were they finally safe.

The point here is that throughout the entirety of 1 Maccabees, “Israel” – which is to say, “the Jews,” reside in Judaea. There are also no pretentions whatsoever on the part of the Maccabees to restore “Israel” to its God-given land, even though they are the “saviors of Israel,” chosen by God.

This discussion of 1 Maccabees’ portrayal of Hamonaean actions outside of Judaea brings us back full-circle to Jonathan and Demetrius at Kedesh. Jonathan had not been given any of the Galilee by any Seleucid ruler, and 1 Maccabees does not portray Mattathias or any of his sons as having any desire to return Israel to its God-given land, even when doing so would require little more than the strategic insertion of a few sentences. 1 Maccabees depicts Jonathan as simply returning to Jerusalem after defeating Demetrius and overrunning Kedesh – not settling Jews there, not leaving soldiers behind, but winning a battle and going home. There is no good reason to think that anything else happened.

---

53 Issue of areas added to Judaea – seems to be a totally historical account of what happened….and it’s only a couple of little areas, not a bunch more. There seems to be no exaggeration here. See 1 Maccabees 10:30; 1 Maccabees 10:38; 1 Maccabees 11:28; 1 Maccabees 11:34; 1 Maccabees 11:57; Ant 13:50; Ant 13:127. See also the following for juxtapositions of Judaea and Samaria: Ant 12:7; Ant 12:154; Ant 12:175; Ant 13:50; Ant 13:125; Ant 13:127; Ant 14:411; Ant 14:450; Ant 17:319; Ant 17:342; Ant 19:274; Ant 19:351; Jwr 1:302; Jwr 2:96; Jwr 3:48; Jwr 3:51
54 “Savior of Israel” is only explicitly used of Judas at 1 Macc. 9:21, but implied for the other brothers – see 1 Macc. 5:62.
Jonathan at Kedesh

We can explain how (and, in some cases, why) 1 Maccabees depicted the Hasmonaevans and their actions, but that only takes us back to the mind of the historiographer. Why did the Hasmonaevans themselves not attempt to expand Israel’s borders? Why did Judas rescue Jews and bring them back to Judaea in 1 Maccabees 5 instead of bringing Judaea to the Jews? More proximal to our purposes, why did Jonathan not establish a foothold at Kedesh (or even further south in Galilee) after defeating Demetrius and, as we know from the archaeological remains, dislodging the Seleucid administrative hold on the region?

For all of the lionizing that goes on when it comes to discussions of the Hasmoneans rising up, throwing off the yoke of the Seleucid empire, and establishing the only autonomous Jewish state that existed between 586 BCE and 1948 CE, we cannot forget that Jonathan was still a client high priest. He was not a king, but rather an ethnarch who had authority over a very small region (namely, Judaea and 3 small districts). He could not mint coins; he had only recently been authorized to have a standing army (and the text makes it clear that it was only after this authorization that he created one), regardless of the fact that there had been a fighting force of one degree or another prior to that; he built walls around Jerusalem only after being given permission. Any degree of autonomy that we can imagine Jonathan having had at this point in time could not have been more than the taking of calculated risks based on the instability, overcommitments, and weaknesses of his Seleucid overlords. 1 Maccabees presents him as a judge, a high priest, and a divinely-appointed leader of Israel who resides in Judaea and is in control of nothing more than Judaea. Although his brother Simon was made governor over the coast, it is important to note that it was done by a usurping Seleucid
king, and the author of 1 Maccabees goes to no lengths to make it seem like the “savior of Israel” acquired that God-given land for God’s people Israel.

The broader context of the battle that ended at Kedesh was Trypho having provoked Demetrius II’s troops to rebel against him and then effectively usurping the Seleucid throne by declaring a very young Antiochus VI to be king in place of the reigning Demetrius. Antiochus (i.e., Trypho), wanting to gain additional support in his bid for the throne, wrote to Jonathan confirming his high priesthood, setting him over “the four districts,” and declaring his brother Simon to be the governor of the coast from the Ladder of Tyre to the borders of Egypt (perhaps the most ostentatious offer in the entire history of the Hasmonean dynasty). Jonathan then “set out and traveled beyond the river and among the towns, and all the army of Syria gathered to him as allies” (1 Macc. 11:60). Not long afterward we find the account of Jonathan’s battle with Demetrius II and his apparently immediate return to Jerusalem. It is as a result of these political machinations that Goldstein has suggested reading v. 63 as “…Demetrius’ commanders had come to Kedesh in Galilee with a large force, intending to divert him from his mission.” That is, Demetrius II was still in control of much of the coast from Seleucia through Tyre, and Jonathan had aligned himself with the usurpers Trypho and Antiochus. In Demetrius’ eyes Jonathan no longer held office and Demetrius wanted to stop him from organizing forces loyal to Antiochus VI.

55 Cf. the parallel in Ant. 13.145. Goldstein, following Abel and Dalman, suggests that this fourth district might be Akkrabattene. Avi-Yonah suggests that it was the Tobiad stronghold and/or Madaba in Transjordan. Or perhaps it is somehow a reference to the coast, as Antiochus (i.e., Tryphon) makes Simon the governor of the coast “from the Ladder of Tyre to the border of Egypt” in the same letter. See Goldstein, I Maccabees: A New Translation, With Introduction and Commentary, 439; Avi-Yonah, The Holy Land From the Persian to the Arab conquests (536 B.C. to A.D. 640): A Historical Geography, 57.

Hasmonaean Settlement Practices: Gezer, Strato’s Tower, and Beit Zur

There are explicit and implicit references in 1 Maccabees to the Hasmonaean rulers settling Jews in cities (e.g., Gaza, Gezer, Strato’s Tower, Beit Zur, and Joppa – see 1 Macc 9:52; 13:43ff; 14:34; Ant. 13.261). According to the sources this practice was not adopted until Simon’s reign (e.g., 1 Macc. 14:34, 37) and these settlements were created for the strategic security of Jerusalem, Judaea, and Judaean access to the coast (intuitively, but also explicitly at 1 Macc. 14:37). Let us set aside all of the foregoing discussions of literary texts for a moment and investigate from an archaeological perspective the possibility that the Squatters in the Administrative Building at Tel Kedesh were Jews. How do their material remains compare with the excavated strata dating to Hasmonaean settlement periods in cities in which we know that the Hasmonaeans settled Jews? Gaza, Gezer, Strato’s Tower, Beit Zur, and Joppa are cities that 1 Maccabees and Josephus present as having been “colonized” by the Hasmonaeans. The archaeological evidence from Gaza and Joppa is too meager to provide material for comparison, but Gezer, Beit Zur, and Strato’s Tower have yielded enough to at least begin to answer questions about the nature of their inhabitants.

Gezer

In 142 BCE Simon besieged and took the town of Gezer (which had been fortified by Bacchides, who had placed a garrison there), expelled its residents, “cleansed the houses in which there were idols,” thereby “casting out of it all uncleanness,” and resettled it with “men who observed the law.”57 Excavations at Gezer have uncovered

57 1 Macc. 13:43-48. Cf. 1 Macc. 9:50-52. Note also the Greek language graffito discovered by Macalister that reads “To blazes with Simon’s palace” (CIJ II.1184).
houses dated to this period, as well as evidence of destruction by fire (Stratum IIC, Phase 11) and immediate rebuilding (Stratum IIB, Phase 10). A coin of Antiochus VII that was found sealed underneath a Phase 9 surface established its terminus post quem as 133 BCE. As a result, the excavators have suggested that Stratum IIC, Phase 11 and its destruction level should be assigned to Simon’s conquest of the city; Stratum IIB, Phase 10 to Simon’s settlement; and Stratum IIB, Phase 9 to an extensive rebuilding program that was started after Antiochus VII confirmed Judaea’s independence and allowed the Hasmoneans to mint coins. It has been asserted that the pottery of Stratum IIC is markedly different from that of Stratum IIB, and that the Stratum IIB pottery matches the Jews’ “wholesale uniformity of the household inventories of Jewish settlements” that was indicative of their disinterest in (or inability to obtain) imported vessels of any kind – a state of affairs that some have argued to have been found universally in early Hellenistic strata throughout the Central Hill region of Palestine and that “bespeaks a deliberate policy of economic independence” that was “an aspect of Hasmonean policy” and was “in marked contrast to settlements along the coast, in the north, Transjordan, the Negev, and Idumaea, all of which continued to participate in the broader Mediterranean economy.”

---


59 1 Macc. 15:1-6; Gitin, Gezer III: A Ceramic Typology of the Late Iron II, Persian and Hellenistic Periods at Tell Gezer, I,24-26; 31-32. Stratum IIB is dated to 142-100 BCE; Stratum IIA is dated to 100-64 BCE.

Further archaeological evidence for the Jewish nature of Gezer’s residents in the period after 142 BCE comes from stepped, plastered installations in eight houses that Macalister interpreted to be rainwater cisterns but that have since been shown to be miqva’ot. Though Macalister did not date the houses more narrowly than to the Hasmonean period, Reich has argued that the miqva’ot should be dated to the period after 142 BCE on the basis of 1 Maccabees 13:43-48 and the fact that the wing of one of the houses containing a miqveh was built approximately 30 degrees off-axis from the rest of the house, suggesting that it was built after the house. The construction of the northern part of the house was dated to sometime between 198 and 142 BCE, and the southern part of the house (the part containing the miqveh) therefore seems to have been built after 142 BCE. “This house, like the entire town, was not destroyed but was occupied by one of the Jewish families brought to the site by Simon. This family found on the site a house suitable for living but without a miqveh, which was then added to the old house.” This addition was clearly integrated into the structure of the house, as opposed to being a sort of outhouse, and all of the houses containing miqva’ot were built of durable building materials, and were usually roofed with a stone barrel vault.

Aside from these architectural features, not a lot can be said about Hasmonaean Gezer. Most excavators of the site have focused on the Bronze and Iron Ages, and while Macalister claimed to have found a “Maccabean Castle,” he has been roundly criticized.

---

63 Reich, "Archaeological Evidence of the Jewish Population at Hasmonean Gezer," 51.
64 Reich, "Archaeological Evidence of the Jewish Population at Hasmonean Gezer," 51.
for not excavating stratigraphically enough to have known what he had found. As a result, even though he found pottery types and forms that have been found to date to between the mid-2nd century to mid-1st century BCE elsewhere in the Mediterranean, there is no evidence to contradict a claim that they were all deposited prior to the Hasmonaean takeover. However, other finds that have been more securely dated call into question the assertion, noted above, that Hasmonaean Gezer was culturally and economically isolated from the coast, the north, the Transjordan, Idumaea, and the Negev (not to mention the rest of the Mediterranean). Phase IIB, the phase that corresponds to the Hasmonaean takeover of Gezer, contained jars, jugs, flasks, and bowls with parallels at Ashdod, cooking pots with parallels at Akko, and many different types of ESA vessels, most of which have parallels at Ashdod, and which include a mold-made “Megarian” bowl and a fish plate with parallels at Akko. It should be remembered that


67 Examples that date between the mid-2nd century BCE and the mid-1st century BCE include (but are not limited to): Jar types 161B, 163A, 164C; Amphora Type 174; Strainer Type 182J; Flask 183B; Juglet Type 185, 187A, 187B; Amphoriskos Type 189, Bowl Types 194A, 194B; 195A, 195B, 195C, etc.

68 E.g., Cooking Pot Type 239C, dated to the early 1st century BCE.

69 A non-exhaustive list includes Bowl Types 194C, 195C, 197, 203, 205D, 207, 208D, 208F, 209A-D, 201A-C, 211A-B, 212A-B, 213A-B; Fish Plate Forms 214 and 215; Krater 227; etc. A few of these forms
the recent University of Michigan/University of Minnesota excavations at Tel Kedesh have refined the *terminus post quem* for the production of ESA to ca. 145 BCE. As a result, it is unlikely that any of the ESA at Gezer comes from the period prior to Simon’s capture of it in 142 BCE, and the excavators concluded that “the continuity of Hasmonean control of Gezer from 142-64 B.C. is strongly supported by the archaeological evidence, which indicates uninterrupted occupation from Phase 9 through Phase 3, during which time the expanded architectural plan testifies to the growth of the city.”

Perhaps one of the reasons that Gezer has been held up as an example of a site with only Central Hill parallels for its pottery is because the Gezer volume that deals with most of the Hellenistic pottery uses Central Hill sites almost exclusively for comparanda. Whatever the case, the sudden shift in pottery that has been posited does not seem to be borne out by the ceramic evidence. Indeed, the excavators’ description of Phases IIB and IIA are delineated historically, not archaeologically, and a different Field VII excavation of Late Hellenistic (viz., Hasmonaean) domestic strata uncovered a stamped Rhodian amphora handle and a lead weight stamped with the word ΑΓΟΡΑΝΟΜΟΥΝΤΟΣ.

In conclusion, it seems that there is in fact little or no shift in the cultural and economic associations (certainly not the quarantine that has been asserted). But even if that case could not be made, it is clear that the inhabitants of Hasmonaean Gezer had well-built houses and *miqva’ot* with barrel-vaulted ceilings. When they reused structures

---

71 With only a few exceptions, all parallels come from Samaria, Shiqmona, Tiryat Yehuda, Ein Gedi, Ashdod, Ramat Rahel, Shechem, Samaria, Bethel, Tel Mevorakh, Heshbon, and Jerusalem.
72 Seger, ”The Search for Maccabean Gezer.”
for domestic use they built substantial additions with new foundations. In other words, the Hasmonaean settlement of Gezer provides neither an archaeological model nor a parallel for the Squatters at Kedesh.

**Strato’s Tower**

Strato’s Tower, the city that later became the site for Herod’s building of Caesarea Maritima, is not mentioned in 1 Maccabees, but Josephus says that it was procured by Alexander Jannaeus from Zoilus, and he lists it among the cities possessed by the Jews at the end of Alexander Jannaeus’ reign (only to be taken back from the Jews by Pompey). The second century CE text *Megillat Ta’anit* records a tradition that the Hasmonaeans settled Jews there. It reads, “On the 14th of Sivan, the capture of Migdal Zur,” and a 5th century CE scholion makes the following comment:

This refers to Caesarea, the daughter of Edom, which is situated among the sand dunes; for under Greece (i.e., the Seleucids) she was a peg driven into Israel. They (the Jews) could not capture her, since strong men were to be found there. And when the Hasmonaeans became powerful they conquered them (the inhabitants) and drove them out while settling Jews within the city. They declared the day on which they captured it a holiday.

War 1.64-66), leaving only Strato’s Tower and Dor. Alexander Jannaeus took those two cities at the outset of his reign and settled Jews at the former.\(^{76}\)

Excavations of the shoreline north of Caesarea’s Crusader city and west of its Byzantine synagogue have revealed architectural remains that are accepted to have been part of the town of Strato’s Tower. Two chambers in a quay designated by the Caesarea Ancient Harbour Excavation Project as Area J have strata that were dated to the second half of the second century BCE and the latter part of the first century BCE. The pre-Herodian pottery included molded, so-called “Megarian” bowls, ESA plates and bowls, amphorae known from Phoenician and Punic sites to have been used for the preservation of fish, and a few Rhodian amphorae, one of which had a stamp dated to the last quarter of the second century BCE.\(^{77}\) Further excavations nearby discovered the same sorts of pottery, along with Rhodian amphora handles dated to 180-108 BCE.\(^{78}\) A wall in (Raban’s) Area I, which was in a vault inside the Crusader city, produced ESA, cooking ware, and a Rhodian amphora handle from the late 2\(^{nd}\)-early 1\(^{st}\) century BCE in the foundation trench of a wall and the beaten-earth floor above it.\(^{79}\) A finer-grained analysis


\(^{79}\) Avi-Yonah apparently excavated a large Hellenistic building in (or west of?) Field G of the Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima, as well as a rectangular courtyard house in Area A (west of Field G). Neither were ever published. The plan of the large Hellenistic building, however, is published in Raban, ”In Search of Strato’s Tower.” However, the account is a bit confusing. In 1989 Raban wrote in \textit{The Harbors of Caesarea Maritima} that (a) the bulk of the pre-Herodian finds at Caesarea come from the excavations just south and SE of the Caesarea Ancient Harbour Excavation Project’s Area J and from the Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima’s Field G; and (b) there are five structures in this area: (1) a courtyard-style house in Avi-Yonah’s Area A, next to CAHEP’s Area J; (2) a quay in CAHEP’s Area J; (3) a series of 3 basins; (4) a corner of an ashlar building that was exposed at the eastern end of Negev’s Trench D; and (5) the north wall and its towers. However, in 1992 Raban wrote in “In Search of Strato’s Tower” that he spent time going over the material from Avi-Yonah’s large Hellenistic building in Field G and does not mention the
suggests that fine ware was imported into Strato’s Tower up until the time of the construction of Caesarea Maritima (22-9 BCE). Of the fifteen amphorae that possibly pre-date Herodian reconstruction of Strato’s Tower, two are from the Aegean and four come from the eastern Mediterranean generally.

Eighteen coins of Alexander Jannaeus (and only ten Seleucid coins of the entire second century BCE) were found “in the Caesarea environs,” suggesting that the account in Megillat Ta’anit is correct. Hasmonean coins have also been found at other purportedly conquered sites, such as Dor, Gerasa, and Samaria (Kasher 1990:142; Applebaum 1989: 21 n. 51).

---

82 Lee I. Levine, Caesarea under Roman Rule. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 149 n. 144. That said, to my knowledge no Hasmonaean coins have been discovered at Caesarea/Strato’s Tower proper. It appears that Levine’s number comes from H. Hamburger, "Coins from Caesarea and the History of the City," BJPES 15 (1950). However, it is unclear exactly where these coins came from. Hamburger’s survey extended from Nahal HaTaninim (north of Crocodilonopolis) to approximately 1.5 km south of Sdot Yam. While he provides a map with letters that apparently designate where the majority of coins from different eras were found, the only eras identified were the Arab period, the Byzantine period, the period of Constantine and his sons, and the era of the Roman procurators. If the Hasmonaean coins are to be associated with the areas on the map associated with coins of the Roman procurators, then all eighteen coins came from the area southeast of Sdot Yam, which is 2.5-3 km. south of the excavations that have been identified with Strato’s Tower. No Hasmonaean coins, however, are listed in the following works: Oleson and Raban, The Harbours of Caesarea Maritima: Results of the Caesarea Ancient Harbour Excavation Project, 1980-1985; Lee I. Levine and Ehud Netzer, Excavations at Caesarea Maritima: 1975, 1976, 1979, Final report. Qedem (Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1986); Leo Kadman, The Coins of Caesarea Maritima. Corpus Nummorum Palaestinensium (Jerusalem: Schocken, 1957).
The limited extent of the published Hellenistic material does not, perhaps, allow us to say with certainty that the material culture of Strato’s Tower did not change appreciably, even if the actual culture did.\(^83\) However, it is worth noting that the excavators found no evidence for either a decrease in imports or the presence of Judaean pottery in the Hasmonaean era. Twenty-five of the forty-four catalogued ESA vessels have been dated to the 2\(^{nd}\)–1\(^{st}\) centuries BCE or the 1\(^{st}\) century BCE-1\(^{st}\) century CE.\(^84\) Only of 4 of the 9 catalogued “kitchen vessels” that have a date span covering the Hasmonean period are from a Palestinian provenance, along with only 6 of 15 of the coarse wares (and we would expect coarse wares to be local). In addition, a skyphos dating to the Hellenistic period/1\(^{st}\) century BCE found, as well as an eastern Mediterranean cup, an Italian jar, and a western Mediterranean jar dated to 125-30 BCE.\(^85\) If these strata are evidence of Jewish occupation, these Jews did not eschew non-Jewish pottery in the way that many scholars envision them to have done.

Perhaps more important for our purposes, there is also no indication whatsoever that there was any architecture that looked anything like the Squatters’ at Kedesh. As with Gezer, the Hasmonaean-period architecture was solid and well-built.

**Beit Zur**

Beit Zur was also conquered at various points during Hasmonean rule and occupied, to one degree or another, by Jews. According to 1 Maccabees, it was initially

---

\(^83\) This is partly due to the extent of excavations at the northern edge of Caesarea Maritima, partly due to the fact that Avi-Yonah never published the Hellenistic building, and partly due to the extensive Byzantine building activity that severely damaged earlier levels – see Avner Raban and R. R. Stieglitz, "Caesarea," *IEJ* 38 (1988), 271-278.


\(^85\) Jars: p. 95-6;
conquered by Judas, who stationed a garrison there. It was subsequently retaken by Antiochus V (or, more likely, Lysias), who stationed a guard there, refortified by Bacchides, and retaken by Simon, who “removed [the residents] from there, took possession of the city and set a garrison over it” (καὶ ἠξίωσαν αὐτὸν τοῦ δεξιᾶς λαβεῖν καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐξέβαλεν αὐτοῖς ἐκείθεν καὶ κατελάβετο τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἔθετο ἑπ’ αὐτὴν φρουράν). Beit Zur is also mentioned in the decree passed by the nation lauding Simon’s achievements as a city on the border of Judaea that Simon fortified, which fits the pattern of Hasmonaeans resettling conquered cities with Jews when the cities lie on the border of Judaea. However, it is unclear as to whether or not he resettled the city or just placed soldiers there. The decree apparently read,

He fortified the cities of Judaea, and Beit Zur on the borders of Judaea, where formerly the arms of the enemy had been stored, and he placed there a garrison of Jews. He also fortified Joppa, which is by the sea, and Gazara, which is on the borders of Azotus, where the enemy formerly dwelt. He settled Jews there, and provided in those cities whatever was necessary for their restoration.

86 1 Macc. 4:29-61; 6:7, 26-31.
87 1 Macc. 6:28-50.
88 1 Macc. 9:52; 10:12-14.
89 1 Macc. 11:65-66. See also the poem in 1 Macc. 14:7 and the summary of Simon’s accomplishments in 1 Macc. 14: 33. The parallel in Josephus is in Ant. 13.155-156: “…[Jonathan left Simon] in Judaea, who raised as large an army as he was able out of the country and then camped before Beit Zur and besieged it, that being the strongest place in all Judaea; for a garrison of Demetrius’ [soldiers] held it, as we have already indicated. But as Simon was making siege ramps and raising his siege engines with being very eager about his siege of Beit Zur, the garrison was afraid lest the place should be taken by Simon by force and they all be killed, so they sent to Simon and requested oaths that they would not be harmed by him, but would be allowed to leave the place and go to Demetrius. And he gave them his promise, threw them out of the city, and placed a garrison of his own in it.” (ἐν στρατῷ ἐκ τῆς χώρας συναγεγόν ὡς ἐν τῷ ἱκανώτατον τὴν Βέσσαραν πολυρρχῶν προσκάθευσεν χωρίαν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ὁχιρώτατον κατέτειχεν γὰρ αὐτῷ φρουρά Δημητρίου δεδήλωσεν ὡς ἔμεν τοῦτο καὶ πρότερον ὡς ἐχθρότατον τὸν Σίμωνα μηχανήματα ὡς ἐστάτος καὶ πολλὴ στρατιὰ συνερχόμενος πρὶν τὴν τῆς Βεσσαρίου πολυρρχῶν ἐδείκνυεν οἱ φρουροί ἵνα κατὰ κράτος ἐξαρθήσησιν τῷ χωρίῳ διαφορώδεις πέμποντος πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα ἢ ἐντὸν ὅρκους ἐλαφώτες ὡστε μηδὲν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ παθεῖν καταλαμψῖν τὸ χωρίον καὶ πρὸς Δημητρίου ἀπέλειπεν· ὡς δὲ τοῦτο παρὰ αὐτοῖς τός πίστεις ἐκβάλλετε μὲν ἐκεῖνοις ἔκ τῆς πόλεως αὐτοὺς δὲ φρουράν καθίστησιν ἰδίων).
90 1 Macc. 14:27-46, esp. 33-34. It seems clear that the decree was passed by the bulk of the nation, and not just Simon’s adherents, from the compromises between political factions that make their way into it. See Goldstein, I Maccabees: A New Translation, With Introduction and Commentary, 493 ff.
91 καὶ ἠχύρωσεν τὰς πόλεις τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ τῆν Βέσσαραν τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρίων τῆς Ἰουδαίας οὐ ἦν τὰ ὅπλα τῶν πολεμίων τὸ πρότερον καὶ ἔθετο ἑκεί φρουράν ἀνδρὰς Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἰσπην ἠχύρωσεν τὴν ἐπὶ
Does the phrase “he settled Jews there, and provided in those cities whatever was necessary for their restoration” (καὶ κατῴκησεν ἐκεῖ Ἰουδαίους καὶ ὧσα ἐπητήρεια ἦν πρὸς τῇ τούτων ἐπανασκέψει έθετο ἐν αὐτῶν) refer only to the cities mentioned immediately before, namely Joppa and Gazara, or does it refer to Beit Zur as well? Unfortunately, Josephus only summarizes the first part of this passage (adding Jamnia to Gazara and Joppa as the list of cities that Simon conquered), and Beit Zur is not mentioned at all. Goldstein has argued that 1 Macc. 14:7 does not refer to the repatriation of Jews, in part because of the possibility that the author of 1 Maccabees here drew on Habakuk 1:9, “the sole biblical parallel,” and notes that the decree of the Jewish people in 14:29-49 does not mention that Simon captured Beit Zur. Be that as it may, the evidence is sufficiently ambiguous to provide support for either argument.

Furthermore, although it is clear that a Hasmonean garrison was placed in the city sometime between 145-143 BCE, and likely remained there at least to the time of John Hyrcanus, and although there is no elucidation of the ethnic makeup of that garrison, it

92 Ant. 13.213-215. Beit Zur is only mentioned in Ant. 13.42 with specific reference to Jonathan (it was also besieged by Simon while Jonathan was in the Galilee – see Ant. 13.155): “And Jonathan dwelt in Jerusalem…and he gave orders that the city walls should be rebuilt…and when those in the garrisons that were in Judaea saw this they fled to Antioch, all except the ones in the city of Beit Zur and the ones in the citadel of Jerusalem, for the great part of these were the wicked and deserting Jews and on account of this they did not abandon their garrisons.” Goldstein has argued convincingly that 1 Macc. 15:15-24 should come after 14:24, and that a likely explanation for this misplacement is that sheets of the scroll were pasted together in the wrong order prior to Josephus receiving a copy (based on the fact that the displaced passage contains 1005 Greek letters – that is, approximately three full columns – and that a three-column sheet would have been common). Josephus, then, discarded both the letter to the Romans and the decree of the Jewish people about Simon because they did not make chronological sense, yet found a way to relate Simon’s ties to Rome “without giving an embarrassing date” (Ant. 13.217). See Goldstein, I Maccabees: A New Translation, With Introduction and Commentary, 493-494.

was almost certainly Jewish, for although the Hasmonaean army had mercenary units, there is little to no evidence for them prior to the reign of John Hyrcanus I.\(^{94}\) We might speculate that if the soldiers were Jewish, then the town was also resettled with Jews – a hypothesis supported by the fact that the population of Beit Zur began to decline after John Hyrcanus conquered Idumaea (ca. 125 BCE – see below), thus obviating the need of a garrison at Beit Zur; but that is by no means certain.

Nevertheless, although Beit Zur might not be representative of an “official” Hasmonaean colony, there was a Hasmonaean presence, so perhaps the archaeological remains can provide some information about the material culture of its Jewish settlement. The excavators note that Beit Zur was a prosperous town under Antiochus IV. A marketplace, cisterns, reservoirs, and numerous bathrooms were found (including bathtubs and foot baths). The old Middle Bronze Age wall was reconstructed ca. 165 BCE (i.e., after Judas took Beit Zur) and it is possible, if not likely, that Phase II of the citadel was constructed at this time as well. The third citadel was apparently built by Bacchides, around 161 BCE. After Simon’s conquest of Beit Zur the town returned to a peaceful existence and the population expanded outside the city walls, as is exemplified by a house that was built against the outside face of the city wall. The population gradually declined and the city came to an end in the first quarter of the first century BCE. Twenty-nine Rhodian or other stamped jar handles were found that date to the Hellenistic period (though more exact details have not been published). The numismatic

---

\(^{94}\) Josephus says that John Hyrcanus I was the first to employ foreign troops (\textit{Ant.} 13.249 and \textit{War} 1.61). Kasher thinks that these passages have been misplaced by Josephus into the events of 129 BCE and thinks it more likely that the enlistment of foreign mercenaries took place between 122 and 108 BCE, based on his belief that it makes more sense that John Hyrcanus would have started to employ mercenaries during a time of tranquility (cf. \textit{Ant.} 13.372). See Aryeh Kasher, “The Changes in Manpower and Ethnic Composition of the Hasmonaean Army (167-63 BCE),” \textit{JQR} 81, no. 3-4 (1991), 325-352: 346.
evidence corroborates this interpretation: 180 Seleucid coins were found, dated to between 225-96 BCE, along with 20 Hasmonaean coins, dated to between 125-78 BCE.95

Once again, the architecture and finds in Hasmonaean strata at Beit Zur look very much like those at Gezer and Strato’s Tower: not cut off from the trade and commerce of the region, and exhibiting architecture and wealth that is very much unlike that of the Squatters. All of the data and analysis in this chapter leads to only one conclusion: textually and archaeologically there is no reason to think that Jonathan settled anybody at Kedesh after defeating Demetrius in 143 BCE. When the analysis of the history, texts, and material culture of the mid- to late-2nd century BCE are combined with Chapter 1’s theoretical discussion of the ways that ethnicity and social culture are expressed in material culture, there is simply no good reason to think that the change in material culture should be regarded as a change in ethnicity.

The question of who the Kedesh Squatters were, and where they came from, must therefore return to the metaphorical Square One and begin by carefully considering the archaeological evidence for them.

95 Robert W. Funk, “Beth-Zur” in Ephraim Stern, ed., NEAEHL, 1:259-261 (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993); Robert W. Funk, “The 1957 Campaign at Beth-Zur,” BASOR 150 (1958), 8-20; Lapp and Lapp, “A Comparative Study of a Hellenistic Pottery Group from Beth-Zur.” Lapp characterizes the numismatic evidence as reflecting “‘intensive occupation’ in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, a very limited occupation between 160 and 145 B.C., and a larger community again in the reigns of Demetrius II, Antiochus VII, and John Hyrcanus.” It should be noted, however, that many numismatists, chief among them Ya’akov Meshorer, have argued that Alexander Jannaeus was the first Hasmonaean to mint coins, no matter how 1 Macc. 15:6 is interpreted. The first known Hasmonaean coins bear the name Yehohanan, which could be either John Hyrcanus I or Alexander Jannaeus (whose Hebrew name was Jonathan). Meshorer finds good evidence for Alexander Jannaeus, while Rappaport thinks that it was John Hyrcanus I and Ronen prefers Aristobulus I. For the evidence in favor of Meshorer’s argument, see Meshorer, Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period; Meshorer, "The Beginning of Hasmonaean Coinage.", which provides new evidence and is contra Kanael, "Ancient Jewish Coins and their Historical Importance." See also Meshorer, Ancient Jewish Coinage. For Rappaport’s argument see Rappaport, "The Emergence of Hasmonaean Coinage."; Kadman, The Coins of Akko Ptolemais. For Ronen’s position see Ronen, "The First Hasmonean Coins."
Chapter 4
The “Squatters” at Tel Kedesh

The chapter that follows provides all of the evidence for the presence and character of the Squatters’ habitation of the building, as well as the logic exercised in the interpretation of the often ambiguous data, which constitute the foundation for the rest of this dissertation.\(^1\) The reason for belaboring the archaeological data in such a technical way is twofold: (1) to provide what might be the first-ever close archaeological analysis of rehabilitation of an abandoned building in antiquity (cf. Chapter 5); (2) to provide a quantifiable and qualifiable argument for where the Squatters were in the building and exactly what Squatter presence looked like. This second point should not be dismissed as unimportant, given the ephemeral nature of the Squatters’ material remains. There is only one Squatter primary deposit: a cookpot in a tabun. Other than this, all of the Squatter material mixed up with PHAB and early Roman wall robbing material. In addition, the identifiable Squatter pottery (BCW, ESA, and TGM) accounts for a mere 58.4 kg of the more than 20,700 kg of pottery that was recovered over five and a half seasons at Tel Kedesh. An argument must be made not only for the existence, but for any conclusion with respect to their presence in the building. The importance of these material remains both for the larger social historical and questions with which this dissertation is engaged, require more support than a simple, brief overview of the number and dates of

---

\(^{1}\) Sharon Herbert devised the recording system used at Tel Kedesh and created the database from which I compiled the total pottery and soil weight totals. Peter Stone for created the database of pottery fabric weights that has allowed me to work closely with and digitally manipulate the Squatter data. I could not have examined the Squatters at this resolution without them. I created the database which matches soil and architectural loci with rooms.
their coins, description of what their pottery looked like, etc. Is there an argument to be made for their permanent habitation in the building, or were they seasonal workers? Were women present? Is there reason to believe that a large amount of arrowheads belonged to them? Answers to questions like these provide a more fine-grained picture of the Squatters that in turn contribute to their identification as e.g., families, shepherds, or soldiers. In addition, there is a long history of archaeological scholarship that has passed over poorly preserved “squatter” occupational remains such as these with little more than a sentence (or paragraph) of description, which has left a hole in our understanding of the poor (i.e., the vast majority of the population) in antiquity. One of the contributions that this dissertation makes is a detailed analysis of the material remains of the urban poor of the city of Kedesh, one that could potentially be of use to others in the way that I wished for archaeological evidence of squatting when I was writing this. Unfortunately, these goals cannot be accomplished without presenting the data.

However, many will only be interested in the larger questions with which this dissertation is engaged and will only care about the archaeological conclusions. Therefore I will begin with a short overview of the chronological and archaeological context for the Squatters and then provide summary of the findings. These will be followed by the in-depth analysis of the archaeological evidence that is divided into two sections: the Squatter-used areas of the building and the uninhabited areas of the building (see the Table of Contents). Appendix I provides the naming and numbering conventions used in this chapter and Appendix II provides a short primer on the significance of the various kinds of pottery found at Tel Kedesh.
PART I: BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

The site of Tel Kedesh (33.110133°N/35.530943°E; New Israel Grid Coordinates 249997/779517) is an oblong double tel located ca. 10 miles northwest of Hazor and ca. 0.65 miles south of the modern Israel/Lebanon border in northern Galilee. It is approximately 31 hectares (76 acres), 800 m. long on a NNW/SSE axis and 115 to 300 m. wide on a SSW/NNE axis. The surface of the upper (northern) tel sits at ca. 490 m. above sea level while the lower (southern) tel sits at ca. 450 m. above sea level (see Figure 2).

Tel Kedesh has been more or less continuously occupied from at the Early Bronze Age until 1948. In 1953 Yohanan Aharoni excavated a 17 m.-long step trench in the northwestern slope of the tel in conjunction with the building of modern highway 899 (see Figure 2). He discovered architecture and pottery dating to the Early Bronze Age; abundant pottery from the Middle Bronze Age; and scattered pottery from the Late Bronze Age, Iron Age I and II, and the Hellenistic and Islamic Periods. Additional evidence for limited occupation in the Byzantine period, as well as pottery associated with wall robbing from the Roman period that suggests Roman-period occupation somewhere on the tel, has been found on the southern tel and in the saddle between the southern and northern tels by the University of Michigan/University of Minnesota team. The remains of an Ottoman-period “Water House” and of a village from which Palestinians fled that was abandoned in 1948 are still visible on the east side of the tel and on the upper tel, respectively.

---

Tel Kedesh and the Persian-Hellenistic Administrative Building (PHAB): A Brief Geographical and Historical Orientaion

It has long been known that there was some sort of settlement at Kedesh, at least in the early Hellenistic period. The city is cited twice in the papyri of Zenon, the secretary of Apollonius (who was himself the treasurer of Ptolemy II), who traveled throughout Palestine, apparently collecting tribute. However, until the most recent excavations little else was known of Kedesh as a town aside from Josephus’ writings at the end of the 1st century CE, and nothing whatsoever was known of its administrative authority.

A magnetometric survey of the southern tel in 1998 indicated the existence of a large building at its the southern end. A further five and a half seasons of excavation have revealed that building to be a nearly 1,900 m² administrative center dating to the Persian and Hellenistic periods (Figure 3, Figure 4). It was built ca. 500 BCE and was used continuously until its abandonment, ca. 145 BCE. Its structure in the final phase was that of a rectangular building with its long axis (ca. 51 m.) oriented east/west and a row of rooms along the outer walls. There is a large courtyard to the west of the center of the building, to the east of which is a dining complex. East of this dining complex is a corridor lined by two north/south-running stylobates (the Styolobate Corridor).

The Persian-Hellenistic Administrative Building (PHAB) was abandoned suddenly, as is clear from at least 101 reconstructable or whole vessels found in the

3 P. Cairo Zen. 1 59.004. See Edgar, Zenon Papyri; Westermann, Keyes, and Liebesny, Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century B.C. Dealing with Palestine and Egypt. Both texts apparently date to 259 BCE.
4 Prior to the magnetometry a surface survey was conducted and two probe trenches were dug in 1997, which exposed well preserved Hellenistic remains 0.5 to 1.3 m. below the modern surface. See Herbert and Berlin, "A New Administrative Center for Persian and Hellenistic Galilee: Preliminary Report of the University of Michigan/University of Minnesota Excavations at Kedesh," 17.
5 Excavation was conducted in 1999, 2000, 2006, 2008, 2009, and for a half season in 2010. Another half season is planned for the summer of 2012.
6 The southern tel was gridded into twelve 90 x 90 m. areas, designated W (west), C (central), or E (east), and labeled A-D from south to north. The 81 10 x 10 m. squares within each area are numbered from 1.1 in the southeast to 9.9 in the northwest. See Figure 2 and Appendix I.
building, with large groupings found *in situ* in Rooms N2 and W3, as well as primary floor deposits in other rooms, most notably Rooms W7, W3, S10, and N1. In addition, destruction layers covering otherwise undisturbed primary floor deposits were discovered in Rooms S10 and N1. 7 Among the many whole and mendable vessels were three stamped Rhodian amphora handles dating to 146 BCE. 8 A closer abandonment date of 144-143 BCE is suggested by a Rhodian amphora handle dating to 144-118 BCE 9 that was found among 7 other handles dating to the final phase of the PHAB in the floor deposit of Room W3, a room in which no evidence of Squatter use was found (see below). In addition, all coins of Demetrius II’s first reign (145-143 BCE) for which we have an archaeological context were discovered in rooms not used by the Squatters. 10

As was noted in Chapter 1, an abandonment date of 144-143 BCE corresponds surprisingly well with the Seleucid general Demetrius II’s defeat at the hands of the Hasmonean king Jonathan in the Huleh Valley just east of Tel Kedesh (1 Maccabees 11:63-74). Subsequent to this sudden abandonment the PHAB appears to have lain uninhabited for a short period of time (perhaps 3-5 years), after which it was re-inhabited by the people who are the subject of this study. Though the archaeological details of their occupation will be dealt with below, it is worth noting at the outset that their material culture was very different from that of the PHAB inhabitants. It is impossible to tell

---

7 The fill with evidence of burning (CB35037) at the northern end of the Stylobate Corridor might be further evidence of destruction, as its LDM is TGM and a sandy cooking ware necked cookpot. It’s at the right elevation for a final-PHAB locus and it is immediately under early modern fill.
8 K00SAH010 (146 BCE), K00SAH011 (146 BCE), K00SAH013 (198-146 BCE) in Room N1. K08SAH008 (154/53-146 BCE) was found in the Room S10 floor deposit and, given the destruction layer and proposed function of the room, probably should be interpreted as dating to 146 BCE as well.
9 K06SAH014. The other handles dated to 166-146 BCE (K06SAH009 and K06SAH010), 150 BCE (K06SAH006), 154-153 BCE (K06SAH012 and K06SAH013), 154/3-146 BCE (K06SAH011), and 147 BCE (K06SAH008).
10 K99C022 (CB24012/subsoil), K00C054 (CB46016/Room N4), K00C059 (CB46016/Room N4), K06C017 (CB16040/Room S5), and K06C028 (found in the east dump).
exactly when they showed up and when they left, but numismatic evidence and Rhodian amphora handle stamps suggest that they used the building from around 138 BCE-114 BCE (see Table 1 and discussion, below).

At some point before the second half of the first century BCE the walls of the building were robbed, often quite deeply and sometimes to their Persian-period foundations. It has been suggested that these stones were used for the houses and buildings of the Early Roman town of Kedesh (Josephus knows of a town here in the late 1st century CE, as does the Mishnah, which was compiled around 220 CE). The only further evidence of human activity within the building are three Byzantine-era burials, one Islamic burial, and modern pottery, bullet casings, etc. in the topsoil. It is clear that at some point in the more recent past the area in which the building lies was used for agriculture, as east/west rubble patterns in the topsoil and subsoil around walls suggest plowing in those directions, as do east/west-oriented gouges that have been found on some of the stylobate ashlars.

---

11 This date has been reached as a result of Kfar Hananyah body sherds and form 4a cooking pot rims that were found in the post-robbing fill of many of these walls.
12 See, e.g., War 2.459; 4.105. Cf. Ant. 12:331ff., m. Arak 9:6. There is also a Roman-period temple below the tel on the east side (see Figure 2).
PART II: SUMMARY OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE SQUATTERS

Any precise conclusion about the use of the building after the PHAB’s abandonment is very difficult to arrive at. Nearly everything that was left behind by the Squatters – tabuns, walls, pottery, and objects – was destroyed, strewn about, and mixed up with PHAB material by the people who robbed the walls, and they often dug through floors and into earlier strata in order to retrieve deep wall stones. As a result, Squatter loci are contaminated both with material from earlier PHAB phases and with post-Squatter material. There are only a handful of loci that can be considered to even approximate a primary deposit, and all of the loci with large amounts of material known to be Squatter have both Roman LDMs (Latest Dateable Material - see Appendix I) and a large amount of PHAB pottery. Teasing out what in these loci belonged to the Squatters, what came from the PHAB, and what was deposited after the walls were robbed is incredibly difficult. However, given the things that we know certainly belonged to the Squatters (walls, floors, tabuns, coins, Rhodian stamped amphora handles, ESA, TGM, and BCW – see Figure 5, Figure 6, Figure 7, Figure 8, and Figure 9), some general comments can be made about them.

Date

The Squatters appear to have inhabited the building from ca. 138 BCE to ca. 114 BCE. The abandonment of the PHAB contributes a firm terminus ante quem of 144-143 BCE, and the numismatic evidence suggests that that date might be refined to sometime after 140 BCE, perhaps down to 138 BCE. Soil deposition on top of PHAB floors but underneath Squatter architecture in many parts of the building confirms a short abandonment phase between the PHAB and Squatter phases. Eastern Sigillata ‘A’ (ESA)
pottery was found in Squatter loci but not in PHAB loci (including the abandonment phase), and ESA is known from other sites to have been produced beginning in 140-130 BCE. Of the 60 Rhodian stamped amphora handles that were found, nine were illegible and therefore undateable, 43 dated to the period between 198-145 BCE, and 4 dated to 143-123 BCE. It is worth noting that all four of the Squatter-phase stamped amphora handles were found in rooms that had Squatter architecture. Fifty-six coins were also recovered dating to the Squatter phase. They evenly spanned the period between 138-114/112 BCE (see Table 1) and although the Squatter occupation only constitutes 6% of the total period in which the building was inhabited, their coins comprise 37% of the coins that were found in the building. Fifty-two of the 55 Squatter coins date to the first

13 See, e.g., Slane, "The Fine Wares," in Tel Anafa II, i: The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery. See also the discussion of the Squatters’ ceramic assemblage, below, and especially footnote 30.
14 K00SAH001, K00SAH005, K00SAH017, K00SAH019, K00SAH020, K00SAH021, K06SAH004, K06SAH005, and K08SAH006.
15 K99SAH003, K99SAH005, K99SAH006, K99SAH007, K99SAH008, K99SAH009, K99SAH010, K00SAH002, K00SAH003, K00SAH004, K00SAH006, K00SAH007, K00SAH010, K00SAH011, K00SAH012, K00SAH013, K00SAH014, K00SAH015, K00SAH016, K00SAH018, K06SAH002, K06SAH003, K06SAH006, K06SAH007, K06SAH008, K06SAH009, K06SAH010, K06SAH011, K06SAH012, K06SAH013, K06SAH014, K08SAH001, K08SAH002, K08SAH007, K08SAH008, K09SAH001, K09SAH002, K09SAH003, K09SAH004, K09SAH005, K09SAH006, K10SAH001, and K10SAH002. Interestingly, all of the Rhodian amphora handles in the building date to the Seleucid period (i.e., after 200 BCE).
16 K08SAH003 (143/2-128 BCE, from CB37025 in Room C1b); K06SAH001 (140-138 BCE, from CB37003, in Room W2); K00SAH008 (132 BCE, from CB27013 in the Central Courtyard); K00SAH009 (129-123 BCE, from CB27012 in the Central Courtyard). One other handle, K09SAH003, could conceivably be Squatter, as it dates to 145-143/2 BCE, but it was found in the subsoil of CB2.8 NE, so context does not provide any further clues. K10SAH001 and K01SAH002 (145 BCE) could also be Squatter. They are from the handles of one Rhodian amphora (K10P011), the the rim, neck, and part of the shoulders of which were found sitting upright in early modern fill in the middle of the Stylobate corridor, an area of heavy Squatter activity. However, it is equally possible that the upper portion of a Rhodian amphora from the PHAB (or from somewhere outside of the PHAB) was discovered and reused in the Early Modern period. This would explain the absence of the rest of the amphora.
17 98 coins and 56 Rhodian stamped amphora handles were recovered from the combined PHAB (i.e., pre-Squatter) phases. Note that this number includes all 29 coins that could not be dated more narrowly than to the Seleucid period (“2nd century BCE”), some of which could conceivably date to the Squatter period. The percentage of Squatter to PHAB coins might drop slightly once the official readings of the 2010 coins are made available. If preliminary field readings are correct then there will be a further 10 PHAB coins and 3 Squatter-phase coins, dropping the percentage of Squatter coins to 35.7%.
15 years of Squatter occupation, a number that can be compared to only 12 coins dating to the final 15 years of PHAB occupation.\(^\text{18}\)

The coins and stamped amphora handles also give us the closest possible approximation of the beginning and end of the Squatter phase of the building. Squatter use of the building seems to have changed or tapered off sometime after 123/2 BCE, as the corpus of fifty-two evenly-spread coins end suddenly with a coin of Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII. A further 3 coins dating to 116-112 BCE were found in loci with Squatter material, suggesting a date sometime after 114-112 BCE as a final abandonment (or early wall robbing?) date. One further coin dating to between 58 BCE and 43 CE has been found in the building;\(^\text{19}\) after that there is nothing until the Byzantine period. It is impossible to know how long these coins stayed in circulation in the ancient world, so neither the beginning nor the end dates of the Squatter phase are firm. However, the Rhodian stamped amphora handles, which date to between 143/138 BCE and 129-123 BCE,\(^\text{20}\) lend further support to this tentative conclusion. Furthermore, the density and even distribution of coins during the period of known Squatter occupation, their sudden end, and the deposition of Early Roman pottery (Kfar Hananyah form 4a)\(^\text{21}\) in the soil overlying the robbed walls of the building leads one to conclude that the Squatters could not have continued in the building much past the first quarter of the 1\(^{\text{st}}\) century BCE.

\(^{18}\) Including the 5 coins of Demetrius II that date to 145-143 BCE. K00C027 (CB15001/CB1.5 NE subsoil – 159-158 BCE), K06C032 (CB36029/Room C1 – 159-158 BCE), K08C030 (CB16058/Room S6 – 159-158 BCE), K06C026 (found in the south dump – 159-142 BCE), K08C012 (CB2.6 SE/SW cleaning – 153-144 BCE), K06C007 (CB17002/Room S3 – 153-143 BCE), K06C025 (CB16025/Room S5 – 153-143 BCE), K00C059 (CB46016/Room N4 – 145-144 BCE), K06C028 (found in the east dump – 145-144 BCE), K99C022 (CB24012/CB2.4 NE subsoil – 144-143 BCE), K00C054 (CB46016/Room N4 – 144-143 BCE), and K06C017 (CB16040/Room S5 – 144-143 BCE).

\(^{19}\) K00C028, found in the subsoil of CB1.5 SE.

\(^{20}\) K00SAH009.

### Table 3: Squatter-Phase Coins and Stamped Amphora Handles

*See Figure 5 for a map of their locations.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date BCE</th>
<th>Minting Authority</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Inventory Number</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143/2-128</td>
<td><em>Rhodian Stamped Amphora Handle</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>K08SAH003</td>
<td>CB37025</td>
<td>Room C1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-138</td>
<td><em>Rhodian Stamped Amphora Handle</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>K06SAH001</td>
<td>CB37007</td>
<td>Room W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-132</td>
<td>Autonomous Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K00C012</td>
<td>CB24033</td>
<td>Room E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-132</td>
<td>Autonomous Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K06C002</td>
<td>CB36007</td>
<td>Room C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138-137</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C042</td>
<td>CA95012</td>
<td>Subsoil in CA9.5 NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138-129</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K06C012</td>
<td>CB26013</td>
<td>Topsoil in CB3.9 SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-135</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C007</td>
<td>CB39005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-135</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C011</td>
<td>CB24033</td>
<td>Room E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-135</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C037</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-135</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C033</td>
<td>CB37029</td>
<td>Room C1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-135</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K09C002</td>
<td>CB36045</td>
<td>Room C2/ Northern Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-135</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K09C006</td>
<td>CB37042</td>
<td>Western Corridor/ Central Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-134</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C008</td>
<td>CB24033</td>
<td>Room E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-134</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C030</td>
<td>CB36002</td>
<td>Room C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-134</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C033</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135-134</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C002</td>
<td>CB24033</td>
<td>Room E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135-134</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C020</td>
<td>CB24033</td>
<td>Room E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135-134</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C034</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135-134</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C009</td>
<td>CB16000</td>
<td>Topsoil in CB1.6 NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135-134</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K09C017</td>
<td>CB37007</td>
<td>Room W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135-134</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C045</td>
<td>CB17000</td>
<td>Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135-133</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K09C018</td>
<td>CB15000</td>
<td>Topsoil in CB1.5 NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-133</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C001</td>
<td>CB27000</td>
<td>Topsoil in CB2.7 SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-133</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C003</td>
<td>CB24033</td>
<td>Room E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-133</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C041</td>
<td>CB27013</td>
<td>Central Courtyard (SW corner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-133</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K06C003</td>
<td>CB37007</td>
<td>Room W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-133</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C008</td>
<td>CB26037</td>
<td>Room C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-133</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C015</td>
<td>CB26011</td>
<td>Subsoil in CB2.6 NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-133</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C019</td>
<td>CB37025</td>
<td>Room C1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-133</td>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C028</td>
<td>CB28010</td>
<td>Room W4a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22 Coin and stamped amphora handle were read and dated by Donald Ariel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>132</th>
<th>Rhodian Stamped Amphora Handle</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>K00SAH008</th>
<th>CB27010</th>
<th>Central Courtyard (SW corner)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129-128</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C006</td>
<td>CB27020</td>
<td>Subsoil in CB2.7 SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-128</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C032</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-128</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C053</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-128</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C013</td>
<td>CB37018</td>
<td>Room C1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-128</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C021</td>
<td>CB37025</td>
<td>Room C1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-128</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C043</td>
<td>CB17008</td>
<td>Room S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-128</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K09C022</td>
<td>CB36050</td>
<td>Room C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-126</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C005</td>
<td>CB24033</td>
<td>Room E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-123</td>
<td>Rhodian Stamped Amphora Handle</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>K00SAH009</td>
<td>CB27010</td>
<td>Central Courtyard (SW corner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128-127</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K99C017</td>
<td>CB24011</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128-127</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C036</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128-127</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K00C043</td>
<td>CB36004</td>
<td>Room C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128-127</td>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign)</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K08C011</td>
<td>CB37007</td>
<td>Room W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-125</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K99C004</td>
<td>CB24013</td>
<td>Subsoil in CB2.4 SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-125</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K00C004</td>
<td>CB24033</td>
<td>Room E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-125</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K00C039</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-125</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K00C045</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-125</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K08C014</td>
<td>CB37007</td>
<td>Room W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-125</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K08C022</td>
<td>CB37025</td>
<td>Room C1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-125</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K09C020</td>
<td>CB23004</td>
<td>Topsoil in CB2.3 SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-123</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K00C009</td>
<td>CB24033</td>
<td>Room E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-123</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K00C013</td>
<td>CB24033</td>
<td>Room E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-123</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K00C035</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-123</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K00C040</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-123</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Akko-Ptolemais</td>
<td>K06C008</td>
<td>CB37007</td>
<td>Room W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123-122</td>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII</td>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>K99C008</td>
<td>CB24000</td>
<td>Topsoil in CB 2.4 NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116-103</td>
<td>Ptolemy IX/X</td>
<td>Paphos</td>
<td>K00C038</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114-112</td>
<td>Antiochus IX</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>K00C017</td>
<td>CB24036</td>
<td>Room E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114-112</td>
<td>Antiochus IX</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>K09C024</td>
<td>CB36045</td>
<td>Room C2/ Northern Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588BCE-43CE</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>K00C028</td>
<td>CB15001</td>
<td>Subsoil in CB1.5 SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Architecture

The Squatters inhabited the central portion of what had been the Administrative Building. The Squatters divided up the PHAB space by building partition walls, which were built of stone but were not as wide as those of the PHAB (0.45-0.65 m., vs. 0.80-1.0 m.), were shallowly founded, and were often not straight. They also built 7 tabuns (ovens) in a way that made it clear that the PHAB had gone out of use (for instance, two tabuns were constructed in the middle of the Northern Corridor and two other tabuns were constructed in the Stylobate Corridor – see Figure 9). Sometimes the Squatters reused PHAB floors, and where they did not they had mostly beaten-earth floors. However, in a few places (namely, the Stylobate Corridor and the northwest corner of the Central Courtyard) they built nice, crushed limestone surfaces.

Squatter architecture exists only in the northern part of the Western Corridor, the northwest corner of the Northern Corridor, the northern part of the Stylobate Corridor, and in Rooms C1, C2, C6, C7, and E3. They also rebuilt or built up the walls between Rooms E1, E2, E3, and E4 – see Figure 9). In other words, there is no Squatter architecture south of Room C6, which is approximately 2.7 m. southeast of the center of

---

23 CB36036 and CB36037 in Room C1; CB36022 and CB36033 in Room C2; CB37005 between Room W2 and the Western Corridor; CB26033 in Room C5; CB25035 between Room E1 and Room E3; CB24009 and CB24010 between Room E1 and Room E3; CB24005 between Room 2 East and Room E4; and CB23001 between Room 2 East and the Eastern Corridor. The Squatter-built walls in CB2.4 tend to be as wide (or wider) than the PHAB walls because they were built on top of PHAB walls. See the discussion of rooms Room E1, Room 2 East, Room E4, and Room E3.

24 CB35042/CB36042 in the Northern Corridor; CB37030 in the Western Corridor; CB37031 in the northwest corner of the Central Courtyard; CB36024 in Room C2; CB25004 in the Stylobate Corridor; CB25005 (an upside-down Hermon Jar reused as a tabun) in the Stylobate Corridor; and CB25041 in Room E3.
The stamped amphora handles are also concentrated in the northern half of the building, and while four coins were found south of Room C6, three of them were in topsoil (see Figure 5 and Table 1).

This Squatters’ building and remodeling activity occurred in at least two phases, as is evident from wall CB37005 in Room W2 (page 142); the two floors laid around tabun CB25041 in Room E3 (see below, page 171) floors CB37040 and CB37032 in the Western Corridor (page 144); floors CB35003 and CB35005 in Room C2 (page 153); and suggested by floors CB37023 and CB37019 in Room C1a (page 132).

The Ceramic and Non-ceramic Assemblages

As was explained in Chapter 1, at least 101 reconstructable vessels were recovered that are associated with the final, pre-abandonment phase of the PHAB (i.e., vessels that were left behind and/or destroyed in situ when the building was abandoned). Among them were no vessels in Eastern Sigillata A (ESA), Basaltic Cooking Ware (BCW) or Tan Gray Marl (TGM), all pottery fabrics that are associated with the Squatters (see Figure 6, Figure 7, and Figure 8). The reason for the ESA is chronological: the PHAB analog to ESA is Black Slipped Predecessor (BSP), which has been shown by Neutron Activation Analysis to be chemically identical to ESA.

---

25 From the center of Room C6 it is ca. 27 m. to the west wall of the building and ca. 25 m. to the east wall; 20 m. to the north wall and ca. 15 m. to the south wall.
26 For an in-depth discussion of all wares and forms found at Kedesh, including petrographic analysis, see Stone, "Provincial' Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context."
27 Peter Stone, personal communication. See also Stone, "Provincial' Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context," especially chapter 5.
28 Peter Stone, personal communication. See also Stone, "Provincial' Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context."
production of BSP began around 160 BCE, while ESA was produced beginning around 140-130 BCE. As a result, BSP is found in final-PHAB loci and ESA is found in Squatter loci. ESA is a very clean, hard, light pinkish brown (5YR 7/4) fine ware that was fired at an extremely high temperature – as high as 850-900°C. It has a semi lustrous to lustrous red slip that was applied by dipping vessels into a vat of slip, and it was produced on the northern Levantine coast (between Antioch and Beirut, and possibly also on the northern and eastern portions of Cyprus).

BCW, which was the main cooking ware of the Squatters (see Figure 6), was made from clays derived from the volcanic soils of the central and northern Golan Heights or the Khorazin plateau above the northern end of the Sea of Galilee, ca. 20 km. southeast of Kedesh (see Figure 1). It is characterized by a ferruginous matrix containing some silt-sized grains of minerals derived from basalt (i.e., plagioclase, olivine, iddingsite, and augite) that was tempered with 5-7 percent of crushed crystalline

32 Shapiro, Berlin, and Stone, "Tel Kedesh - Fabrics and Wares," 1ff.
33 There were a few gritty cooking ware vessels that were clearly Squatter.
34 Shapiro, Berlin, and Stone, "Tel Kedesh - Fabrics and Wares," 20.
calcite, with rhombic and angular grains varying in size between 0.1 and 1.0 mm. This information is important for two reasons, one ancient and one modern. Some ancient potters added calcite to the fabric of cooking vessels to prevent them from fracturing as the elements of the clay expanded and contracted at different rates when heated. The calcite increases the fabric’s tensile strength without decreasing its ability to conduct heat, allowing potters to create more efficient thin-walled cooking vessels. It was thought that this practice died out in the Iron Age, perhaps as a result of the depopulation of the Galilee after the invasion of Tiglath-Pileser III. From a modern archaeological perspective, the calcite temper in the matrix of the fabric, which is visually very different from the main PHAB cooking wares (sandy cookware and gritty cookware), allows easy identification in the field. Basaltic Cooking Ware is known in earlier contexts elsewhere in the Galilee (for instance, at Gamla), but it is entirely absent at Kedesh in strata that pre-date the abandonment of the building.

Both the inclusion of calcite in the fabric of BCW and the high-necked forms that have been found at Kedesh are reminiscent of potting traditions from Lower Galilee and the Central Hill region near Shechem and Jerusalem. BCW replaced the cooking wares of the PHAB (sandy cooking ware and gritty cooking ware), which were produced on the

---


36 For more references, see Chapter 1.


Mediterranean coast (probably in the Acco-Ptolemais region), ca. 40 km to the west.

BCW was not found at Tel Anafa, where the Late Hellenistic Stuccoed Building (LHSB) was being built during the time that the Squatters were living in the administrative building at Kedesh, nor at Tel Dan (the cooking wares at Tel Anafa were primarily sandy cooking ware and Spatter Painted Ware). The cooking pots with high splayed necks, which is the most common form in the Squatter assemblage, are also unknown at Tel Anafa.

Tan Gray Marl (TGM) appears to be a Squatter replacement for the Spatter Painted Ware that was found in the PHAB and at Tel Anafa (see Figure 8). There is no evidence that Spatter Painted Ware vessels continued to be brought into the building after its abandonment (though one vessel may have been reused), vessels in both fabrics function as table ware. The provenance of TGM has not been established, but it is thought to have been made locally, perhaps in the Naphtali heights to the west of the Huleh Valley, where Kedesh is located. Spatter Painted Ware was probably made somewhere in the Huleh Valley or the Golan Heights.  

The Squatter assemblage is a domestic assemblage, as is clear when it is compared with that of the PHAB phases and the LHSB at Tel Anafa (which was a villa). Most indicative of this conclusion are the proportions of utility, cooking, and table vessels in the overall assemblage. The cooking vessels, which made up 34-59% of the

---

39 Note, however, that Neutron Activated Analysis of twelve samples of what Berlin had identified as Spatter Painted Ware showed that only four came from the same manufacturing center. See Jan Gunneweg and Joseph Yellin, “Appendix 2: The Origin of Some Plain Ware Pottery from Tel Anafa,” in Tel Anafa II, i: The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery, ed. Sharon Herbert (Ann Arbor, MI: Kelsey Museum, 1997), 240.

40 The ceramic assemblage data that follows are the conclusions of the Tel Kedesh ceramicist, Peter Stone, based on rim counts and his stratification and phasing of the site. The ephemeral nature of the Squatter material remains requires an upper and lower number of the possible Squatter vessels. See Stone, “Provincial Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context.”
Squatter assemblage (371-446 vessels), as compared to 12% of the PHAB assemblage and 31% of the Tel Anafa assemblage, was almost entirely comprised of BCW cooking pots, stew pots, and casseroles, although there were a few gritty cooking ware necked cooking pots with grooved rims and necked pointed rim cooking pots. The table ware consisted of 119 vessels (9-19% of the assemblage, as opposed to 35% of the 3rd century BCE PHAB assemblage, 61% of the 2nd century BCE PHAB assemblage, and 25% of the Tel Anafa assemblage), and included 34 cast glass drinking vessels, Tan Gray Marl bowls and saucers, and ESA plates and bowls. The table vessel assemblage is far more varied in terms of the types of fabrics represented (including imported wares) at Tel Anafa and in the PHAB than in the Squatter phase within the PHAB. However, the ratio of 3-4 small bowls and saucers to large plates in the Squatter phase is the same as at Tel Anafa. Utility vessels account for 9-13% of the Squatter assemblage (83-126 vessels), as opposed to 5% of the PHAB assemblage and 11% of the Tel Anafa assemblage. They include curled rim mortaria, Tan Gray Marl jugs with squared rims and round bottoms, overhanging rim kraters (perhaps), and Phoenician Semi-Fine flasks (perhaps). The Squatter storage/transport vessels make up 4-8% of the total Squatter assemblage (much like Tel Anafa’s 3%), and include only mid-sized jars, as opposed to mostly large jars in the PHAB phases. There are a few Phoenician Semi-Fine baggy jars and the four Rhodian amphorae that belong to the Squatter phase (though it is impossible to tell if the Squatters drank the wine that was originally in the amphorae or simply reused the vessels). The Phoenician Semi-Fine vessels, which were produced somewhere on the

---

41 This and what follows (with respect to the Squatter assemblage and comparisons to the PHAB and Tel Anafa) are from Peter Stone’s work on the ceramic assemblages at Tel Kedesh. See Stone, "Provincial' Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context," Chapter 5.
Phoenician coast, seem undoubtedly to have been bought or imported by the Squatters, but their presence in such great quantities in the PHAB phases and the lack of clean, sealed, or primary Squatter loci prohibits any assessment of the quantity in the Squatter phases. As a result we can only say that they comprise 0.5-16% of the Squatter assemblage (3-220 vessels). Squatter service vessels must have been Phoenician Semi-Fine, as no service vessels were found in other fabrics, and so they comprise 0-20% of the assemblage (0-284 vessels). Toilet vessels comprised less than 1%-9% of the Squatter assemblage (6-122 vessels), which is roughly the same as at Tel Anafa.

The rest of the artifacts that were excavated are much more difficult to assign to either the Squatter or the PHAB phases, given the disturbed nature of the Squatter loci and the undateable nature of the finds. However, again a few tentative conclusions can be reached. When loci with the highest density of Squatter pottery are sorted, there are few non-ceramic inventoried items. However, three items that show up in quantity are copper alloy spatulas, loom weights, and fibulae. Three of the six copper alloy spatulas recovered from the building were found in the top twenty most Squatter-pottery-dense loci, and another was found in a locus that had some Squatter pottery in it. Fourteen of the 28 loomweights, and all of the pyramidal loom weights, that were found in the building came from loci with Squatter pottery in them. There were 4 loom weights in the

---

42. Phoenician Semi-Fine is highly represented in all of the PHAB phases of the building, and, as mentioned above, the Squatter phase was highly disturbed, often having been dug through by the wall robbers, thus mixing Squatter-phase pottery with PHAB-phase pottery. The resulting picture is one in which it is very difficult to distinguish the degree to which the Phoenician Semi-Fine in the Squatter phases belonged to the Squatters (as opposed to being intrusive PHAB-phase pottery). For a more full description of the highly disturbed nature of the Squatter phase, see below. Note also Stone’s conclusion that the Squatters did indeed have Phoenician Semi-Fine vessels.

43. The loci were sorted not by the greatest amount of Squatter pottery, but by the greatest density. CB35011 had the greatest amount of Squatter pottery (5 kg of BCW and 0.1 kg of ESA), but the total amount of pottery in the locus was 134.65 kg, so the /density of Squatter pottery to non-Squatter pottery was only 3.8%.
top 25 most Squatter-pottery-dense loci and 6 in the top 35. Finally, eight of the 18 fibulae found in the building (5 copper alloy and 3 iron) were found in loci with Squatter pottery; 3 copper alloy fibulae were in the top 35 most Squatter-pottery-dense loci.

**Abandonment**

As in modernity, there were a wide variety of reasons for and types of abandonment in antiquity, including catastrophic, gradual, permanent, episodic, seasonal, punctuated, and agricultural. In the case of the Squatters it is difficult to say which type best represents them. On the one hand, there is a relatively small amount of pottery in the building, and very few whole or reconstructable vessels, suggesting that the vessels that were being used when the Squatters left were taken with them. If abandonment had been rapid, we would expect that things of value and things of small bulk would be taken first; thus pottery would likely have been left behind in greater quantities. On the other hand, the bulk of the coins were found in two pits in Rooms E1 and E2 with a large amount of detritus that suggests that they may have been small hoards that were inadvertently swept into the pit with other trash, probably by the people who robbed the walls (who might have been the Squatters themselves). The coins in the pits, plus the cooking pot that was found *in situ* in a tabun, suggests rapid abandonment – or at least the inability to return to

---

44 The excavation of various mining camps in the southwest Yukon in the 1970s produced evidence of various types of abandonment behaviors. Though abandonment behavior of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Alaska might seem to be irrelevant for the study of the Hellenistic Mediterranean, the study confined itself to questions of the manner in which sites were abandoned (i.e., gradually or rapidly) and whether the inhabitants planned to return. As a result, “even though archaeological sites may differ in content through time and space, the processes responsible for their initial formation should remain generally the same. While the exact nature of these processes may vary with level of technology, cultural conditioning, material availability, etc., cultural materials still predominantly are transferred from the systemic to the archaeological context by processes of discard and abandonment, regardless of what is being transferred and why.” See Catherine M. Cameron and Steve A. Tomka, eds., *Abandonment of Settlements and Regions: Ethnoarchaeological and Archaeological Approaches*. New Directions in Archaeology: Abandonment of Settlements and Regions: Ethnoarchaeological and Archaeological Approaches (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 261.
retrieve the coins. Furthermore, when BCW and ESA were found in any quantity, they were primarily found in different areas of rooms or the building (i.e., there were no loci with both high amounts of ESA and high amounts of BCW).\textsuperscript{45} It is possible that this is the result of pre-abandonment caching, but we would probably expect any caching to have been in the same place, regardless of vessel type or ware. Rather, the separation of cooking pots and table wares suggests the possibility that they were in their original locations when the Squatters left, which, if true, also suggests rapid abandonment.

\textsuperscript{45} For example, the locus that had the highest amount of ESA and BCW together was CB35011, which had 5 kg of BCW and 0.1 kg of ESA (in a total of 134.7 kg of pottery).
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As noted above, the Squatters primarily inhabited the central part of the building
(see Figure 5, Figure 6, Figure 7, Figure 8, and Figure 9). What follows is a room-by-
room analysis of Squatter presence within the Administrative Building.

**The Northern Corridor (Figure 10)**

The Northern Corridor presents one of the best cases of both Squatter presence
(some of the best-preserved loci are from this area of the building) and of clear

---

46 What follows is the result of my personal analysis of the 1,086 loci that comprise the excavation of the
PHAB and Squatter phases of the building at Tel Kedesh, often at the level of one or more of the the more
than 3,500 units. That said, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the fact that I came to this project
after Sharon Herbert had preliminarily stratified the excavation and thank her for allowing me to see copies
of the stratigraphic reports that she submitted to the Israel Antiquities Authority at the end of each season. I
would also not have been able to analyze the results of the pottery field readings as quickly if it were not
for Peter Stone’s digitized database of those readings. It should be pointed out that those pottery readings
included 54 separate categories and occurred at the unit [not the locus] level, and so constitute an enormous
undertaking.
reappropriation of PHAB space. A column drum and a line of stones\textsuperscript{47} were placed at the east end of the corridor, effectively blocking passage (see Figure 11).\textsuperscript{48} West of this blockage they built a tabun (at the border between trenches CB3.6 and CB3.5),\textsuperscript{49} and a group of stones just west of it seems to be deliberate as well. This tabun constitutes one of the few primary deposits left from the Squatter phase. It was found with a nearly complete Basaltic Cooking Ware cookpot\textsuperscript{50} inside of it, further confirmation that the Basaltic Cooking Ware was the standard ware for Squatter cookpots (see Figure 11).

This tabun’s construction is typical of other Squatter tabuns: the interior walls were made of orange clay, and large pot sherds, faced plaster fragments, and flat stones were attached to the exterior (see Figure 13). The internal diameter at the base was 0.69 m. and the walls were 7 cm. thick. The tabun tapered as it rose and the internal diameter at the highest point of preservation was 0.65 m. The cookpot found \textit{in situ} inside the tabun was resting on a layer of ashy gray soil. As with many other (but not all) parts of the building in which we have found Squatter-use installations, no floor was found to be associated with the tabun itself, though there were a few small patches of floor nearby\textsuperscript{51} with a surface elevation of 464.58 m. (the bottom of the bottom of the tabun was at 464.62 m.).

There is no reason to think that the walls of the PHAB in the Northern Corridor were not still standing throughout the Squatter phase, but the floors had been covered

\textsuperscript{47} CB35024
\textsuperscript{48} The LDM in CB35024.1 was Coastal Fine South, Spatter, and Sandy cookware, but it does not make sense to posit the column drum as part of the PHAB. Furthermore, the LDMs in and under floor CB35025, on which the column drum sits, were BCW and a high-necked sandy cookware cookpot.
\textsuperscript{49} CB36042/CB35042
\textsuperscript{50} K10P056
\textsuperscript{51} CB35023
with an abandonment layer of silt. This layer, a 16 cm.-thick layer of fine, silty yellow-brown soil with virtually no stone or pebble inclusions, was found directly on top of the PHAB Northern Corridor floor. Rather than removing this abandonment deposition and reusing the floor that was already there, the Squatters created new surfaces on top of it. To the east of the column drum it was a cobble surface and between the column drum and the tabun it appeared as 3 small patches of plaster/limestone floor. To the west of the tabun they reused the floor of the final phase of the building.

**Room C1, including areas C1a and C1b (Figure 14)**

Room C1, as excavated, presents an interesting problem in that the wall between Room C1 and the Central Courtyard was robbed down below the level of the courtyard

---

52 CB35025.1
53 CB35026. Though the LDM in CB35025.1 was BCW, the BCW was only found in the upper elevations, immediately under the cobbles. Besides, it makes more sense to understand the Squatters’ laying a cobble floor 16 cm. above the PHAB floor as the result of the soil being there when they arrived than to interpret it as manual fill (which included some of their own pottery) that was put on top of a nice PHAB floor in order to lay another floor. Furthermore, CB35025.1 had between 10.4 and 16 grams of pottery per liter of soil (the average was 13.8 g/L), which is a very small amount. This, plus the fact that the soil had virtually no other inclusions, suggests that its deposition was the result of abandonment. How did the BCW get underneath the cobbles? Perhaps it was used as a soil surface for some time before the cobbles were laid.

54 CB35025
55 CB35023
56 CB36039/CB46023. At some point during the life of the PHAB wall CB36041 (the southern wall of room Room N3) was torn down and floor CB36039/CB46023 was laid throughout Room N3, over the top of wall CB36041, and throughout the Northern Corridor. Room N3 was likely open to the elements after this remodeling (see below). There is also an issue of varying elevations here. The PHAB floor that the squatters reused at the west end of the Northern Corridor and in Room N3 (CB36039/CB46023) was found at ca. 465.09 m., while the surfaces east of the tabun are approximately 50 cm. lower. The bottom of the tabun was found to be at 464.62 m., the plaster floor patches were at ca. 464.58 m., the bottom of the column drum was at 464.60 m., and the cobble surface was at 464.56 m. This may be due in part to elevations dropping off as one moves from west to east across the tel (a phenomenon that occurs across the site), but it also means that there was a step down somewhere in the western part of the Northern Corridor. Evidence for the former includes the fact that the upper elevation of the southern wall of the Northern Corridor (CB36038/CB35012), which was not robbed, drops from 464.95 m. in the west, to 464.80 m. at the western edge of CB 3.5, to 464.80 m. at the eastern edge of CB 3.5. Evidence for the latter includes the fact that floor CB35026, the PHAB-phase floor in the eastern extreme of the Northern Corridor was at 464.33 m. and the PHAB-phase floor in the western extreme of the Northern Corridor (CB36039/CB46023) was at 465.09 m.

57 CB36034, upper elevation of 464.84 m.
The fact that the wall was robbed before excavation means that we cannot know if there was a doorway through which to access the Central Courtyard from this room, though one possibility is that there was a doorway between Room C1 and the Central Courtyard exactly where the wall is most deeply robbed – namely, in the exact center of that wall, where it crosses the CB3.6 SW/CB3.7SE baulk line. The argument would be that doorways would present the only possible way to find oneself “on top of” a wall in order to remove its stones (for that is the easiest way to rob stones from a wall) if the mudbrick superstructure of the wall had not yet collapsed.

The final-PHAB configuration of Room C1 is difficult to determine. The Squatters created a small room in the SE corner of room C1, 2.7 x 2.4 m., with an 0.8 m.-wide doorway. They did this by building two partition walls: an east/west wall abutting PHAB wall, and a north/south wall that is bonded to the east/west wall (see Figure 13). No foundation trenches were dug for the construction of these walls, and no floor surface was found in Room C1. Within Room C1a there was an installation consisting of a stone trough that had been broken into two pieces and set side-by-side, ca. 0.7 m.

---

58 CB36035, upper elevation of 464.92 m. There is no reason to think that this wall was not extant in the Squatter phase. The plaster of the courtyard floor stopped at the wall and did not continue over the top of it, as floor CB36039/CB46023 did between the Northern Corridor and Room N3 (see above, p. 98, n. 56). It is possible that the Squatters robbed this particular wall in order to allow access between the Central Courtyard and Room C1, but there is no evidence for it.

59 Another option, though less likely, is that there was no wall here, but that Room C1 was open to the courtyard. However, if this were the case it would require some sort of columnation to hold up the roof, and there is not enough space between the top of what is left of wall CB36034 to host the ashlars that we see in this kind of construction elsewhere in the building. Compare the stylobate ashlars that still exist in wall CB16030, between Room S4 and Room S5, and the way that the cobble subfloor has been laid up against the top of the drafting on the face of the ashlar, leaving them to stick up above the floor slightly. The same phenomenon occurs in the interaction between the floors laid up against stylobates CB25001 and CB25007.

60 Most doorways in the PHAB did not have a threshold stone. Instead, the plaster of the floor was laid over the top of the wall foundation (see, e.g., Figure 29 and Figure 32).

61 CB36037
62 CB36018
63 CB36036
64 K06S024
east of the north/south wall and ca. 1.7 m. west of the PHAB wall. Between these trough halves and the PHAB wall were 9 paving stones\textsuperscript{66} that ran up against east/west Squatter wall (see Figure 15). All of these features had roughly the same founding and surface elevations.\textsuperscript{67}

The interpretation of Room C1b is more problematic than the Northern Corridor or Room C1a. As noted above, the wall between the Central Courtyard and Room C1b has been robbed down to 464.99 m. (high)/464.81 m. (low). The courtyard floor immediately to the south\textsuperscript{68} is at 464.92 m. (see Figure 16). The wall that divides between the Western Corridor and Room C1b\textsuperscript{69} has been robbed down to 465.36 m. (high)/465.05 m. (low), and that high point consists of only a ca. 70 cm.-long section of wall immediately north of the intersection with the east/west wall that divides between Room C1b and the Central Courtyard. In other words, while there is a lot of Squatter material in this area, it all has been found in highly disrupted contexts. For example, because the wall between Room C1b and the Central Courtyard had been so deeply robbed, the soil on top of the courtyard floor, on top of the pavers in Room C1a, and coming down on the troughs in Room C1a constituted a contiguous soil locus (i.e., the soil looked the same and was dug as one depositional unit until the robbed-out wall was found).\textsuperscript{70} However,

\textsuperscript{65} CB36033
\textsuperscript{66} CB36017
\textsuperscript{67} The top of the pavers was at 465.09/465.03 m, and they were sitting on a soil surface at 464.87 m. The elevation of the rim of the trough halves was 465.16, and the elevation of the trough portion was at 465.07 m. The trough halves were sitting on a soil surface at 464.91/464.82 m. The founding level of wall CB36037 was at 464.79 m. and the founding level of wall CB36036 was at 464.74 m. The distance between the extant pavers and the nearest edge of the trough halves was 0.6 m. It is unknown if there were originally more pavers (taken as part of the robbing episode), or if these 9 stones constituted the entirety of the original surface. It is worth noting that a juglet base with a false ring foot dating to the 1st century BCE-1st century CE was found between the paving stones, undoubtedly from the robbing episode.
\textsuperscript{68} CB37022
\textsuperscript{69} CB37002
\textsuperscript{70} CB36027
even when the soil units that were dug on top of the courtyard were separated out,\textsuperscript{71} there was still a significant amount of material that was ambiguous with regard to the question of whether it belonged to the Squatters left it, such as an astragalus;\textsuperscript{72} a Phoenician Semi-Fine juglet,\textsuperscript{73} a bronze tool,\textsuperscript{74} a basalt hand stone fragment,\textsuperscript{75} a basalt mortar base,\textsuperscript{76} another bronze tool,\textsuperscript{77} two iron tools,\textsuperscript{78} and a glass bowl body sherd\textsuperscript{79} in unit CB3.6.061B, and a bronze tool\textsuperscript{80} and ceramic funnel\textsuperscript{81} in unit CB3.6.064.

The same can be said for the rubble that was excavated from above the courtyard floor in in CB 3.7 SW,\textsuperscript{82} which is one of the soil loci which contains large amounts of Squatter material but had pottery spanning from the Bronze Age to the Byzantine period.\textsuperscript{83} It had Kfar Hananya, ESA, BCW, a coin of Antiochus VIII and Cleopatra,\textsuperscript{84} a coin of Demetrius II’s second reign,\textsuperscript{85} a coin of Antiochus VIII,\textsuperscript{86} an ESA dish rim,\textsuperscript{87} a casserole rim,\textsuperscript{88} a Hellenistic Black Glaze cup,\textsuperscript{89} a Hellenistic Black Glaze pottery sherd.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{71} CB3.6.060, CB3.6.061A, CB3.6.061B, CB3.6.063, CB3.6.064, and CB3.6.067.
  \item \textsuperscript{72} In CB3.6.060.
  \item \textsuperscript{73} K06P043
  \item \textsuperscript{74} K06M030
  \item \textsuperscript{75} K06S026
  \item \textsuperscript{76} K06S025
  \item \textsuperscript{77} K06T#1011
  \item \textsuperscript{78} K06T#1006 and K06T#1007
  \item \textsuperscript{79} K06T#1143
  \item \textsuperscript{80} K06T#1020
  \item \textsuperscript{81} K06P051
  \item \textsuperscript{82} CB37007
  \item \textsuperscript{83} The other soil loci containing Squatter material are CB37018 (a 1 m\textsuperscript{2} probe in the NE corner of CB3.7 SE); CB37025 (the remnants of wall robbing activity); and CB37027 (the fill of disturbed soil associated with the construction of wall CB37021). There is one coin of Antiochus VII (K08C033) and a fragment of an ESA hemispherical bowl that were found in baulk trimming units CB3.7.142 and CB3.7.111, respectively.
  \item \textsuperscript{84} K08C014 (126-125 BCE)
  \item \textsuperscript{85} K08C011 (128-127 BCE)
  \item \textsuperscript{86} K08C017 (135-134 BCE)
  \item \textsuperscript{87} K08P070
  \item \textsuperscript{88} K08P071
  \item \textsuperscript{89} K08P215
\end{itemize}
with an “X” on it, an hollow iron pipe fragment, an Attic lekythos, a Persian White Ware jar rim, and a Persian White Ware saucer. This is a typical picture of Squatter material remains: the non-ceramic finds cannot be assigned to a period, Squatter or otherwise.

What can be said, with certainty, is that the Squatters used this room. The walls that enclose the room certainly were in place, as was the doorway into Room N3. A small piece of floor composed of plaster mixed with soil and pebbles could have been a Squatter surface; another floor nearby, constructed of limestone chips and soil, probably was not, given its elevation. Alternatively, this latter floor might be evidence of two Squatter phases, as is the case elsewhere (e.g., tabun CB25041 and the floors around and under it in Room E3), in which case the pavers (and walls?) in Room C1a constitute a second phase, and this surface, along with some nearby stones constitute a squatter use surface (perhaps the original building floor) and some sort of wall/installation (perhaps even a wall that was dismantled).

---

90 K08I001
91 K08M024
92 K08P088
93 K08P034
94 K08P217
95 CB37019, at an elevation of 464.97 m. (the pavement in Room C1a was at 465.03-465.09 m.).
96 CB37023 (at elevation 464.72 m. in the west and 464.67 m. in the east). The foundation of the Squatter walls in Room C1a were at 464.74 m. and 464.79 m.
97 CB37021
The Central Courtyard – Architecture (Figure 17)

The variable nature of elevations within the Administrative Building is perhaps nowhere better exemplified than in the thick, sturdy Central Courtyard floor, which was found at 464.93 m., 464.98 m., 465.00 m., 464.92 m. (high)/464.55 m. (low), 464.76 m., and 464.79 m. Architecturally there are several features in the courtyard that are the result of the Squatters’ use of the building. In the northwestern corner of the Central Courtyard (in the southeastern corner of CB 3.7 SE) there is a section paving stones above the courtyard floor (see Figure 32). The LDM of the soil among these stones, as well as in the soil on top of them, was a sherd of a high necked cookpot, and the LDM underneath them was ESA. There were also pieces of PHAB wall plaster found in the soil underneath the pavers, which is a common find in Squatter loci, as well as chert blade fragments.

Approximately 2.5 m. west of the western edge of these pavers the Squatters built a tabun and embedded an ashlar in the floor 7 cm. to the south (see Figure 18). As with the tabun in the Northern and Western Corridors, chunks of face plaster from the

---

98 The Central Courtyard consists of the area bounded on the north by wall CB36034/CB37020 (running between the Central Courtyard and Room C1), on the west by wall CB37002/CB27001 (running between the Central Courtyard and the Western Corridor), on the south by wall CB27004/CB17003/CB16034 (dividing between the Central Courtyard and Room S2, S3, and S4), and on the east by CB16030/CB26001/CB36018 (dividing between the Central Courtyard and Room C3, Room C5, and the South-Central Corridor).
99 CB36033
100 CB36033
101 CB37026
102 CB26006
103 CB27008
104 CB17015
105 CB37017, with an upper elevation of 465.15 m./465.11 m.
106 CB37026
107 CB37017.1
108 K08T#1372
109 CB37026
110 CB37031. It stood 22 cm. east of wall CB37002 and 45 cm. south of wall CB37020 and was 73-79 cm. in diameter and slightly oblong, with ca. 5 cm.-thick walls.
PHAB walls and pottery were affixed to the outer walls, and no floor was found. The courtyard floor in this area\textsuperscript{111} was found to have three laminates (from 465.00 m. down to 464.84 m.) and the tabun was found to either have been cut through all of the floor laminates or placed on the floor and then the upper laminate(s) laid up against it.\textsuperscript{112} The limestone ashlar that was embedded in the floor appears in the photos to be lying flat, with an upper elevation not more than 5 cm. above that of the floor and, as noted above, 7 cm. southwest of the tabun.\textsuperscript{113} The LDM of the soil both inside the tabun\textsuperscript{114} and above it\textsuperscript{115} was BCW, and while no identifiable pottery was found in the 0.1 m. underneath it, there were two pieces of plaster, suggesting that construction post-dated the deterioration of the plaster-faced building walls.

In the southeastern corner of the courtyard (in CB2.6 SW) a plaster bin was found sitting upright on the courtyard floor at a declination of ca. 13 degrees to the east of the north/south axis of the building (see Figure 19). Its dimensions were ca. 0.9 x 0.95 m. and while its north and east sides were well and moderately preserved, respectively, its south and west sides were not preserved at all. It was sitting on a layer of soil at an elevation of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item CB3702
\item The locus and unit sheets simply say that the tabun was cut through the floor (see the locus sheet for the courtyard floor, \textit{CB37026}). However, the existence of a 3 laminate plaster floor in relation to a tabun is reminiscent of the (Squatter) three laminate plaster floor in CB 2.5 (\textit{CB25039, CB25040, CB25042, CB25043}). In that case the second laminate was cut through, a tabun was placed on the lower laminate, and the upper laminate was laid up against the tabun. Furthermore, the photos from CB3.7 SE indicate that the upper laminate is laid up against the tabun walls – there is no soil between the plaster surface and the tabun. The final report says that “We came down upon a squatter era tabun, \textit{CB37031}, cut into the courtyard floor, \textit{CB37026} … This is on top of a crushed limestone floor, \textit{CB37026}, 22cm East of \textit{CB37002}, and 45 cm south of wall \textit{CB37020}. It is 7cm NW of a limestone ashlar embedded in the limestone floor.” The locus sheet for the tabun (\textit{CB37031}) says the same thing. There is no further evidence on the unit sheets. Taken together, it seems that we have the same situation here as in CB 2.5. The bottom of the tabun wall was at 464.85 m.
\item The limestone ashlar did not receive its own locus number and it appears that no elevations were taken (it is not mentioned on the unit sheets and was neither drawn nor the elevations recorded on the top plans).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
464.63 m. that was on top of the courtyard floor (which was at 464.55 m.). A sherd of ESA was discovered in the soil sealed by the bin, revealing it to be either used by the Squatters or, more likely, thrown there during the wall robbing episodes. Ca. 1.1 m. southwest of this bin, and similarly oriented with respect to the building walls, was a stone basin lying up against the wall dividing the Central Courtyard from Room S4. It, too, appears to be the result of a robbing episode; however, its proximity to another similarly-oriented bin and a strangely-oriented wall leave open the possibility that this is a disturbed Squatter installation.

Another wall was discovered extending 0.72 m. into the Central Courtyard from the wall that divides the Central Courtyard from Room S4 at a 68 degree western declination from that wall (see Figure 21). It is difficult to determine whether or not it constitutes Squatter construction. When it was first excavated in 2006 it continued into the unexcavated area of CB2.6 SW, but when CB2.6 SW was excavated in 2008, no evidence for the wall could be found. However, there was a cut in the courtyard floor with what appeared to be one course of a wall in it (see Figure 19), though this course of a wall seemed to be oriented more truly north than that found in 2006. Whether the two walls were connected and the upper courses of CB26029 were robbed, or CB16023 had nothing whatsoever to do with CB26029, is unknown. It should be noted that the top of the one course of stones that constitutes CB26029 as found was at 464.60 m., which is

---

116 The top edge of the bin was at 464.96 m. and the bottom (inside the bin) was at 464.71 m
117 K06S023
118 CB16034/CB17003
119 CB16023
120 CB16034
121 CB16023 had four courses, to an absolute elevation of 465.10 m. (high)/465.03 m. (low), and it was 0.60 m. wide. It was preserved to a height of 0.67 m. Note that this is the same width as the Squatter walls in Room C1 (CB36037 and CB36038).
122 CB26029
the same elevation as the courtyard floor next to it. A small patch of plaster floor (CB16024) to the east of wall CB16023 was found to be laid up against it and over the lowest course, with a surface elevation of 464.62 m.

The LDM among the stones in wall CB16023 was Late Roman and Byzantine, but the LDM in the 0.1 underneath the wall and plaster floor was a Phoenician Semi-Fine lagynos, which need not be later than the occupation of the building. Furthermore, there was no deeper floor found – it seems that CB16024 is the PHAB courtyard floor. That said, there was also mud brick present in the 0.1 m. underneath it, suggesting (but not necessitating) a construction date for both the floor and the wall after the abandonment of the building. The conclusion that these strangely oriented walls belong to a PHAB phase of the building seems unlikely (they are built like, and to the same dimensions as, the Squatter walls in Room C1; besides, what function would they serve?). The most likely explanation is that the floor CB26006/CB16024 (or at least the upper surface/laminate of it), as well as walls CB16023 and CB26029, belong to the Squatter phase of the building.

Another patch of floor123 was discovered just west of the stone basin K06S023, at an elevation of 464.79 m. (the courtyard floor here is at 464.79/464.77 m.). This floor is likely the same as a patch of plaster floor found in the southeastern corner of CB 2.7 SE.124 It potentially (though not certainly) provides further evidence for a terminus ante quem for the Squatter habitation, for a Phoenician Semi-Fine plain rim saucer lid and a (possibly) Roman Jar rim were found in the sealed 0.1 m. underneath it.

In the southwestern corner of the courtyard is a small room (Room S1) that is impossible to say whether or not the Squatters used. It was built by the construction of

---

123 CB17015
124 CB27015, at 464.85 m.
two walls (see Figure 22). The east/west wall is of pier and rubble construction and runs east from the western wall of the Central Courtyard (a PHAB-phase wall), while the north/south wall was found to bond with PHAB wall CB17003/CB27004. The LDM underneath the two walls was Local Fine and Hellenistic wheel-ridged cookware – nothing that need date later than the PHAB. However, even though these two walls sit higher than the Central Courtyard floor, the fact that they bond with the two walls of the courtyard makes it extremely unlikely that the Squatters built them. However, their existence at the time of excavation (not to mention the LDM of Kfar Hananya cookware within wall CB27006) means that they (and therefore room Room S1) existed at the time that the Squatters were in the building. The floor in Room S1, a plaster floor with a surface elevation of 465.01 m. (high)/464.95 m. (low), was well above the courtyard floor but had Hellenistic wheel-ridged cookware and a Phoenician Semi Fine baggy jar in it, and the 0.1 m. beneath it had an LDM of Sandy cookware (2nd century BCE).

The Central Courtyard – Soil Loci (Figure 17)

As noted above, the wall that divides Room C1 from the Central Courtyard was robbed down below the level of the courtyard floor (which lies at ca. 464.92 m. in this part of the courtyard). It seems likely that the door between Room C1 and the Central Courtyard was at the place where that wall is most deeply robbed, namely at the center of

---

125 Wall CB27006, running north/south and bonding to the southern wall of the Central Courtyard (CB17003/CB27004), and wall CB27005, running east/west and bonding with the west wall of the Central Courtyard (CB27001). It was preserved to 465.22 m. and had a founding elevation of 464.88 m.
126 CB27005. It was found preserved to 465.22 m. (high)/465.08 m. (low) and was founded at an elevation of 464.95 m.
127 CB27001
128 CB27006
129 CB27007
130 CB27008, at 464.75 m. here.
131 CB37020
the wall, where it crosses between CB3.6 SW to CB3.7SE (see section on Room C1, above). As a result of the nearby ancient congress between these two areas and the subsequent robbing episode, it is difficult to determine what of the material found in the soil locus on top of the courtyard floor in CB 3.6 SW might have belonged to the Squatters. On the one hand, the nearby features – the paving stones, the tabun, and the ashlar to its south – testify to Squatter presence. On the other hand, as previously discussed, the precise nature of that presence (are the tools theirs? The chert blades?) is unclear.

Squatter material was found in the upper elevations – for instance a coin from Demetrius II’s second reign, an ESA dish rim, and a coin of Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII. However, this locus is essentially subsoil, and the lowest of these items was found above 465.35 m. A large amount of Squatter material was recovered from the soil and debris from the robbing of the wall between the Central Courtyard and Room C1b: 0.85 kg (plus 10 sherds) of ESA in 10 units, a high necked cookpot in one unit, three coins, and a stamped Rhodian amphora handle. However, everything except 3 sherds of ESA were found in units dug north of that wall. On the other hand, the...
soil associated with the robbing of the wall dividing the Central Courtyard from the Western Corridor\textsuperscript{142} had much more Squatter material in the units that overlay the Central Courtyard: 1.55 kg of BCW (plus a further 13 sherds),\textsuperscript{143} one sherd of ESA, one cast glass body sherd, a coin of Antiochus VII, and plaster.\textsuperscript{144} As for the rest of the material in these loci, once again it is as yet impossible to determine what belongs to the Squatter phase and what is from the PHAB phase. The Squatter material in \textit{CB37025} is mixed in with material that is certainly not Squatter,\textsuperscript{145} as well as material that is ambiguous.\textsuperscript{146}

Throughout the courtyard the picture stays the same. A rubble layer that extended across CB2.6 NW\textsuperscript{147} contained a high necked sandy cookware cookpot, 0.35 kg (plus 1 sherd) of ESA, and an ESA platter with a ring-foot base.\textsuperscript{148} The soil underneath this rubble layer,\textsuperscript{149} which came down on the courtyard floor had a further 6 sherds of ESA, plaster, and glass;\textsuperscript{150} and the soil in a cut in the courtyard floor\textsuperscript{151} had another sherd of

\textsuperscript{142} Soil locus \textit{CB37042}, wall \textit{CB37002}.
\textsuperscript{143} CB3.7.190: 0.6 kg of BCW; CB3.7.195: 4 sherds of BCW; CB3.7.196: 4 sherds of BCW; CB3.7.198: 0.45 kg of BCW; CB3.7.199: 0.5 kg of BCW; CB3.7.204: 5 sherds of BCW.
\textsuperscript{144} The ESA is from CB3.7.199; the cast glass body sherd (K09T\#584) and the coin (K09C006 – 136-135 BCE) are from CB3.7.197.
\textsuperscript{145} K08C018 (Alexander III, 336-323 BCE); K08C020 (Antiochus III, 222-187 BCE); K08C005 (Antiochus IV, 175-173 BCE); K08P035 (a Punic amphora); K08P099 (a spatter ware mortarium); K08P094 (Attic black glaze); K08P095 (and Orange Jar rim); K08P014 (a gritty cookware cookpot rim and handle); K08P105 (a Persian cookpot); K08P117 (an Iron Age bowl); K08L010 (an Erotes lamp fragment); K08L013 (a folded lamp fragment).
\textsuperscript{146} K08C024 (a coin unreadable but known to be Seleucid); K08P072 (a BSP bowl fragment); K08P218 (a Peach-Grey Jar fragment); K08P080 (a Phoenician semi-fine amphoriskos); K08M006 (a net hook [?]); K08M010 (a double hook); K08M013 (a fibula arch and pin); K08M025 (an iron tack); K08M011 (a medallion); K08BD001 (a double-pierced trapezoidal agate bead); K08BI005 (a bone spatula).
\textsuperscript{147} CB26013, extending from 465.28 m. down to 464.92 m. (the courtyard floor is at 464.92 m. [high]/464.84 m. [low] here).
\textsuperscript{148} K06P022. CB26013 had an LDM of Kfar Hananya cookware. The ambiguous material here includes a generic Seleucid 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE coin (K06C012); a nail (K06M012); a Delphinform lamp (K06L010); and a BSP plate rim (K06P023). The non-Squatter material in \textit{CB26013} includes an Attic wheelmade lamp (K06L020); a Cypriote black/red rim (K06P001); and a mortarium that joins with fragments from \textit{CB26019} (K06P066).
\textsuperscript{149} CB26019
\textsuperscript{150} CB26019 had 1 small sherd of Early Islamic pottery, as well as Early Roman cookware. Ambiguous material includes a Delphinform lamp (K06L011); an iron hook or latch (K06M013); a bronze knife fragment (K06M014); a BSP plate (K06P034); illegible Rhodian stamped amphora handles (K06SAH004
ESA, Judaean style cookware, Late Hellenistic cookware, and wall plaster. The same sort of pattern can be seen in CB 2.6 SW. Fill and rubble covering most of CB 2.6 SW and coming down on the courtyard floor had an LDM of ESA in five of its seven units. The total amount of ESA (0.1 kg) was complemented by 0.01 kg of BCW, high-necked cookpot fragments, and 0.38 kg of a Brindisi amphora (late 2nd-1st centuries BCE).

There is further good evidence for Squatter presence in Room S1, but the bulk of it is again in higher elevations. The soil above the floor in Room S1 and the upper floor above the courtyard in the southeastern corner of CB 2.7 SE had 2 ESA rims and a BCW lid. The soil above the wall dividing between the Central Courtyard and the Western Corridor) had an LDM of blown glass (ca. 50 BCE), ESA, a coin of Antiochus VII, a stamped amphora handle dating to 132 BCE, an ESA incurved rim bowl foot, and an ESA incurved rim bowl. and K06SAH005; bronze rods K06T#579 and K06T#641; and nails and glass. Material that is certainly not Squatter in CB26019 includes a Local Fine wheelmade lamp (K06L012); an Iron Age I fragment (K06P027); a 1st century CE lamp discus (K08T#655); an Attic black glaze lamp nozzle; and a Persian folded lamp.

Five folded lamp fragments were also found in this cut into the courtyard floor, which could as easily be from the soil below the courtyard floor as from the debris scattered on top of it during the wall robbing. From 464.89 m. down to 464.49 m.

As well as a Koan Knidian cup (K00P111), plaster, metal, the base of a moldmade lamp, a folded lamp sherd, a lamp nozzle, and a moldmade bowl. It is worth mentioning that the Koan Knidian cup joins with fragments from CB27019, a fill in the Western Corridor. K00C041 (134-133 BCE) K00SAH008 K00P151. There was a very high pottery density in this rubble locus (19.46 g/L). Ambiguous finds included a Phoenician Semi Fine jug (K00P092); a local motza jar rim (K00P046); a BSP offset rim plate (K00P144); a Phoenician Semi-Fine round mouth table juglet (K00P087); a Phoenician Semi-Fine amphoriskos (K00P156); Rhodian amphora fragments K00P125 and K00P037; a table amphora [WHAT FABRIC??] (K00P189); an amphoriskos or Cypriote juglet (K00P140); a moldmade bowl in ESA or BSP (K00P219); a Phoenician Semi-Fine table amphora (K00P189); a BSP fishplate (K00P157); a BSP hemispherical bowl (K00P107); an imported plate [WHAT FABRIC??] (K00P147); an imported cookpot
Room W2 (Figure 23)

Though the walls in this northern area of the Western Corridor have been robbed to one degree or another,\textsuperscript{163} it is clear that they were in existence during the Squatter phase. The doorway that existed between the Western Corridor and Room N2 during the PHAB phases was blocked up with ashlars and stones,\textsuperscript{164} most likely by the Squatters (see Figure 24). The reasoning for this conclusion is that (a) the room to the north (Room N2) was found with 12 amphorae leaning against the wall, which is typical elsewhere in the building in rooms that went unused after the PHAB was abandoned. Furthermore, it seems very unlikely that the room was blocked off during the life of the Administrative Building. Finally, while the LDM in the soil underneath the doorway blocks was Hellenistic cookware, there was also wall plaster which, while not diagnostic, is suggestive of the Squatters. PHAB wall plaster is associated with many – if not all – of the Squatter loci, probably the result of the degradation of the building over time and the lack of ability or desire on the part of the Squatters to repair the plastered walls. While a good deal of this wall plaster is likely the result of the wall robbing episodes and the subsequent mixing of material from the wall robbing phase(s) with that of the Squatter phase, PHAB wall plaster was used by the Squatters to reinforce and/or insulate their

\textsuperscript{163} CB37001, the western wall of Room W2, is preserved as high as 465.75 m.; \textbf{CB37004}, the north wall of Room W2, is preserved to 465.86 m.; and \textbf{CB37002}, the eastern wall of Room W2, is preserved to 465.12 m.

\textsuperscript{164} CB37003
tabuns and chunks of it, along with flat fieldstones, have been found on the outside of every Squatter tabun.

The southern wall of Room W2, which has been created out of the northern part of the Western Corridor, is also likely Squatter (see Figure 25). Though the LDM underneath it was a wheel-made lamp fragment (i.e., *terminus post quem* of the 5th century BCE), the wall was poorly constructed, ca. 80 cm. thick at its best-preserved point, and had a well-defined north face, suggesting that its builders were using the area to the north. This, plus the facts that this wall has divided the Western Corridor into a room, that the Squatters were clearly using Room W2 (see below), and that it is above the level of beaten earth floor CB37010 (see below) make it most likely that this is a Squatter wall/doorway into Room W2. As with many other Squatter-used rooms in the building, no floor or living surface was found to be associated with this wall.

Evidence for Squatter presence in Room W2, in addition to the installations (see below) includes a coin of Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII, a coin of Antiochus VII, an autonomous Acco/Ptolemais coin, and an ESA molded bowl fragment. All were found in the rubble subsoil and the non-rubble fill below that, both of which covered the entire room.

It is possible that here again we see evidence for two phases. The bottom of (presumably Squatter) wall CB37005 is at 465.31/465.23 m., which is to say that it’s floating 17-25 cm. above (presumably final PHAB phase) floor CB37010. Between the

---

165 CB37005. Upper elevation 465.65 m. (high)/465.63 m. (low); founding elevation 465.31 m. (high)/465.23 m. (low).
166 K06C008 (126-123 BCE)
167 K06C003 (134-133 BCE)
168 K06C002 (prior to 132 BCE)
169 K06P025
170 CB37007; LDM: Byzantine.
171 CB37008; LDM: Early Roman.
two (in elevation, not in loci) is soil locus CB37008 (465.23-465.05 m.), which has an ESA mold made bowl in it, as well as loom weights K06TC004 and K06TC005.172

Another soil surface was also discovered173 that showed signs of having been burnt (it was dark grey to black all the way through its 0.5-1.0 cm. thickness in its best-preserved parts). The few obvious signs of burning elsewhere in the building are, with the exception of Room N1, coterminous with the building’s abandonment. The same is likely here, for this floor’s elevation is 17-25 cm. below the foundation course of wall CB37005 and is a good deal deeper than the PHAB floor in Room N2, just through the doorway to the north (at elev. 465.34 m. [high]/465.14 m. [low]). It is possible (likely?) that there was a step up into Room N2 from the Western corridor as there seems to have been between the Northern Corridor and Room N3 (ca. 10 cm. – 30 cm. step up, depending on which elevation we take for Room N2 as being original – the step up from the Northern Corridor to Room N3 was ca. 40 cm.). Equally likely is that this floor is a Squatter-phase floor. The soil sealed underneath the floor contained a Early Roman cookpot body sherds, as well as a Parthian Green Glazed everted rim bowl fragment.174 How then would we account for the fact that wall CB37005 is “floating” 17-25 cm. above this surface? Here again we see two Squatter phases.

There was also a doorway between Rooms W2 and W1. However, as will be covered below, there is virtually no evidence for Squatter occupation in Room W1. For some reason – perhaps the early collapse of the roofs of the outer rooms – the Squatters seemed not to have used the outer rooms (or, if they did, they didn’t leave things in them).

172 Also arrowhead K06M003
173 CB37010, at elevation 465.06 m.
174 K06P076
The Western Corridor (Figure 27 and Figure 28)

South of room Room W2 there is further evidence of Squatter use. Tabun CB37030\textsuperscript{175} was found without a floor but with a founding elevation of 465.16 m. (high, in the east)/465.08 m. (low, in the west) and an upper preserved elevation of 465.56 m. (see Figure 26).\textsuperscript{176} The walls of the tabun were constructed differently than other Squatter tabuns, being built in two layers, each 2-4 cm. thick, between which was a 3-4 cm. wall of soil. The soil inside the tabun\textsuperscript{177} had PHAB wall plaster and an LDM of BCW. The 10 cm. below the tabun had an LDM of local fine ware. Around the tabun a patchy, friable soil surface\textsuperscript{178} was uncovered at an elevation of 464.40 m., an elevation corresponding to a ring of stones around the tabun (see Figure 29). The LDM in this floor was ESA and BCW, and the LDM of the (admittedly unsealed) 10 centimeters below the floor was BCW (there were also two PHAB wall plaster fragments). To the north of the tabun a small section of flat fieldstone pavers was found\textsuperscript{179} with a surface elevation of 465.32 m. and an LDM of Roman jar (or Roman cookware). The 0.1 m. underneath it had an LDM of (possible) BCW. Once again, these two floors seem to be evidence of two Squatter phases.

In the southern portion of the Western Corridor there is little architecture associated with the Squatters other than the PHAB walls. No floor was found – neither Squatter nor from the PHAB. Indeed, in Room S2, the room that opens onto the Western Corridor in the south where a very impressive plaster floor was found, the floor continues into the doorway between Room S2 and the corridor but stops there (see Figure 30). The

\textsuperscript{175} Ca. 88-96 cm. in diameter. 
\textsuperscript{176} CB37030.0, the soil inside the tabun: 465.43 m. down to 465.16 m. (high)/465.08 m. (low); CB37030.1, 0.1 underneath the tabun: 465.16 m. (high)/465.08 m. (low) down to 464.88 m. 
\textsuperscript{177} CB37030.0 
\textsuperscript{178} CB37040 
\textsuperscript{179} CB37032
floor in Room S2 lay at 465.16 m. in the doorway to the Western Corridor and at 465.08 m. on the east side of the room. Though no floor was found in the southern portion of the Western Corridor, it is interesting to note that tabun CB37030 in the northern part of the Western Corridor had the same founding levels as the floor in Room S2.

The soil loci in the Western Corridor exhibited the problem typical of Squatter material that got mixed in with Early Roman robbing/post-robbing material. Some things are undeniably Squatter, such as the ESA, BCW, a coin of Demetrius II’s second reign, and a cast glass body sherd. However, many items may or may not have belonged to the Squatters: an unfired loom weight, chert blades, a copper alloy fibula arch and pin, an iron rasp fragment, a limestone spindle whorl, and two unfired loom weights from CB37042, a lead fragment, a chert blade, a carnelian bead, an iron tool, a copper alloy fibula arch and hinge from CB37043, a basalt weight, an iron knife blade, a hand stone, and a pestle stone from CB37047; metal and stone jewelry found in CB27018; metal, a molded bowl fragment, lead, glass, and a loom weight found in

---

180 CB17052
181 K00C006 (129-128 BCE), from subsoil locus CB27020
182 From CB3.7.197. Unk. T# (look it up).
183 K09T#012, from CB3.7.198 (unfired loom weight), K09T#??, from CB3.7.195 and CB3.7.197 (two chert blades); K09M011, from CB3.7.199 (copper alloy fibula arch and pin); K09T#700, from ??? (iron rasp fragment); K09S008 (limestone spindle whorl); and K09TC010/K09TC011 (two unfired loom weights).
184 K09T#?? (lead fragment); K09T#?? (chert blade); K09BD003 (carnelian bead); K09M017 (iron tool); and K09M020 (copper alloy fibula arch and hinge).
185 K09S024 (basalt weight); K09S025 (iron knife blade); K09T#?? (hand stone); K09T#?? (pestle stone). Note that this locus is described as “Persian fill … Persian and likely Iron Age material, below CB37030.1 [the Squatter tabun’s 0.1]. However it has 259 fragments of plaster in it and an LDM of Kfar Hananya.
186 K09T#407, from CB3.7.028 (metal) and K09T#399 (stone jewelry), from CB3.7.027.
CB27019\textsuperscript{187}, two pieces of glass found in CB27020\textsuperscript{188}, a basalt hand stone from CB17063\textsuperscript{189} and blue and black spacer beads and an iron tack or nail head from CB17064\textsuperscript{190}. Many of these items (e.g., the carnelian beads, the fibulas, and the loom weights, the catapult bolt) could tell us a lot about who the Squatters were (domestic households? Soldiers? Seasonal farmers or shepherds?) if we could definitively tie them to the Squatters.

**Room S2 – A Room with Questionable Squatter Presence (Figure 31)**\textsuperscript{191}

There are two doorways into Room S2, one on the west, leading into the Western Corridor, and one in its northern wall, leading into the small room that was built into the southwestern corner of the Central Courtyard (Room S1). The final-PHAB floor of Room S2 was 3-5 cm.-thick plaster floor\textsuperscript{192} with a sturdy cobble subfloor.\textsuperscript{193} It was found intact and running up against all four walls, though the floor and subfloor were discovered to be missing in the extreme northeast corner of the room. In the southwestern corner of the room, a rectangular plaster bin was found to have been built on top of the floor and against the walls.\textsuperscript{194}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[187] K09T#451, from CB3.7.031 (metal); K09T#1067, from CB3.7.040 (molded bowl fragment); K09T#1067, from CB3.7.061 (lead); K09T#1753, from CB3.7.061 (glass); and K09T#1521, from CB2.7.088 (loom weight).
\item[188] K09T#114, from CB3.7.006 and K09T#115, from CB3.7.007.
\item[189] K09S006 (basalt handstone). CB1.7.212 and CB1.7.215 were the only units in CB17063 that were dug over/in the Western Corridor. The rest were in Room S2.
\item[190] K09T#538 (blue and black spacer beads); K09T#539 (iron tack or nail head). CB1.7.216 is the only unit in CB17064 that was dug in the Western Corridor. The others were in Room S2.
\item[191] Room S2 is bounded by walls CB17003/CB27004 (on the north), CB17001 (on the east), CB17005 (on the south), and CB17026/CB27001 (on the west).
\item[192] CB17052. Its surface elevation was 465.16 m. (high)/465.08 m. (low).
\item[193] CB17052.1
\item[194] CB17051, built against walls CB17003/CB27004 and CB17026.
\end{footnotes}
The northern doorway (leading into the Central Courtyard) was found to have been blocked. Four large stones had been set vertically in the doorway: one large ashlar up against each door jamb and a two large pieces of limestone blocking the doorway itself (see Figure 33 and Figure 34). Wall plaster was discovered on the eastern door jamb, between the ashlar and the jamb itself, and these were founded at an elevation of ca. 464.92 m., which is to say, at least 10 cm. below the level of the plaster floor in Room S2 (which was at 465.16 m./465.08 m.) and nearly 10 cm. below the plaster floor in Room S1 (CB27007, at 465.01 m. just north of the doorway). The door blocks that were placed against the plastered door jambs were flush with the northern and southern faces of the northern wall of Room S1 and one ashlar was found lying as a stretcher in the doorway, flush with the northern face of the wall, with an upper elevation of 465.03 m. (see Figure 35). However, the two limestone pieces standing upright on the south side of the doorway bellied out into Room S2 and were founded at an elevation of ca. 465.12 m. (i.e., at the level of the floor surface – see Figure 33). The LDM of the soil under and around the southern door blocks was Ras al-Fuqra (i.e., early modern) while the LDM for the soil underneath the elevation of these door blocks (a pass under the cobbles of the subfloor of CB17052, including in the area of the door block) was two sherds of Kfar

---

195 CB17071
196 End CB2.7.056.
197 The northern half of this doorway was dug in 2000, and that is when this ashlar was found. See the unit sheet for CB2.7.066 and the top plan for June 23, 2000.
198 Unit CB1.7.207, dug from 465.42 m. (the top of the two large stones that bellied into Room S2) down to 464.90 m. and locused along with CB1.7.232 as CB17071.1 (see next footnote). Note that, as mentioned in the previous footnote, the northern half of this doorway was dug in 2000 and lay exposed to the elements for nine years before the southern door blocks and the soil around them were excavated. The Ras al-Fuqra pottery (one sherd) found in this unit could be the result of contamination from prolonged exposure, or it could be the result of soil churned up in the early modern period.
Hananya 4a (i.e., Early Roman).\textsuperscript{199} When the door blocks and the stones associated with them were removed, the excavators discovered that the plaster floor of the room did not continue underneath them – it was intact to a point just south of the door blocks. However, it was impossible to tell if the floor had been cut when the door blocks were put in or if the floor was too degraded to find (see Figure 34).

There are four possible interpretations of this door blocking event. It is possible that the blocking of this doorway is coterminous with the blocking of the doorways in the eastern rooms (Rooms W1, W3, W4, and W5), and that all of these blocking events occurred after the Squatters abandoned the building, perhaps associated with reuse of these rooms as animal pens (i.e., coterminous with stone structure CB27002/CB27003 in the Western Corridor, which was at an elevation of ca. 465.70 m.). The second option is that this doorway was blocked in the last phase of the PHAB (prior to the abandonment), at the time that Room S1 was built (the small room in the southwest corner of the Central Courtyard), and perhaps also when the bin in the southwest corner of the room was installed. Room S2 was probably accessed from the Central Courtyard, and this might have been the reason that the door between Rooms S2 and S1 was blocked. This would make sense of the more deeply founded blocking stones that were up against the plaster of the original doorjamb. Furthermore, the door blocking was flush with the northern face of the wall between Room S2 and the Central Courtyard, as opposed to its bellying out on the southern face, perhaps suggesting that the blocking was intentionally executed for the purposes of Room S1’s construction. However, such an interpretation requires an explanation for the fact that the thick plaster floor and subfloor of Room S2 seems to

\textsuperscript{199} Unit CB1.7.232, dug from 464.97 m. down to 464.83 m, and locused along with CB1.7.207 as CB17071.1 (see previous footnote).
have either been laid or refinished after the doorway was blocked (in which case the floor was laid and the walls were plastered with care, but no care was taken to see that the door blocking was flush with the south face of the northern wall of the room). The third option is that the Squatters blocked this door, and that for unknown reasons they wanted to access this room from the Western Corridor but not from the Central Courtyard. This option requires an explanation as to why the Squatters would have dug down to the stones underlying the doorway in order to found the stones deeply against the door jambs, but then placed the other blocking stones at the level of the floor. The fourth option is that there are two blocking episodes in this doorway.

This last option seems the most likely. The inhabitants of the PHAB, throughout its various phases, exhibited a penchant for well-constructed architecture, while the Squatters often built walls on dirt or plaster floors without digging foundations. It would make sense that if this northern doorway was to be blocked during any of the PHAB phases, the PHAB inhabitants would not have simply placed ashlars on top of the plaster floor in the doorway. Rather, they would likely have dug down below the plaster floor to find the wall below it, and would then have founded their stones on the wall. This excavation to find the top of the wall would account for the disturbance of the plaster floor and subfloor in and just south of the doorway. The fact that the door blocks which were placed up against the plastered door jambs were flush with the north and south faces of the wall fit this scenario as well. The two large stones bellying out into Room S2 would then have been placed there after the abandonment of the building. Indeed, the construction of this door block looks very much like the construction of the door block between Rooms N2 and W2 (see Figure 25), which was clearly placed by the Squatters.
The problem with this interpretation is the question of why somebody (presumably the Squatters) felt a need to further block a doorway that had already been blocked (though at the level of the floors of Rooms S2 and S1 this time). The answer is unclear, but there seem to be two possibilities. Either the doorway was later unblocked (between the PHAB phases and the later blockers), or the doorway was not actually blocked the first time around, but was rather narrowed. As noted above, an ashlar was found stretching across the doorway, flush with the northern face, with an upper elevation of 465.03. This ashlar spanned the distance between the ashlars that were placed up against the plastered door jambs and its upper elevation is very close to the elevation of the floors on either side of the doorway. Why a doorway would need to be narrowed is unclear, but the function of room Room S1, as well as the function of Room S2 before and after the placement of the plastered bin, is also unclear. Perhaps more wall space was needed in Room S2. Perhaps cultural sensibilities included a connection between doorway width and the function of space. What is clear is that the original door width (the door with the plastered door jambs) was 1.09 m., an apparently standard width that is similar to other doorways, such as the one between Rooms S12 and S11 (1.06 m.), the one between Rooms S5 and S6 (1.13 m.), the one between Rooms W1 and N1 (1.09 m.), the one between Rooms W3 and W1 (1.09 m.), and others. The narrower doorway, if indeed the doorway was narrowed instead of blocked was between 0.50-0.67 m. (it is difficult to tell exactly because the stones were so degraded). This is a width that is very much like the doorway into storeroom Room W7 (0.52 m.), or the door between Rooms S4 and S5 (0.64 m.)

---

200 Room W7 was found with a thick plaster floor, on top of which at least 5 Hermon jars were found lying on their sides and crushed. The floor continued into the doorway to the north.
The soil on top of the floor in Room S2 had very little Squatter material in it. The LDM was ESA (1 sherd) and BCW (0.14 kg, plus 4 sherds). The rubble above it had an LDM of Roman cookware and 0.26 kg of BCW. As with other areas of the building, these two loci included a lot of material that may or may not have belonged to the Squatters: an iron needle, and iron chisel, a carnelian spacer bead, a copper alloy strip, and a stand lamp in CB17063 and a folded lead sheet, iron plate, another carnelian bead, a TA 129 cup rim, and an iron catapult bolt from CB17064.

Did the Squatters use this room? It’s hard to say. The doorway opens into the Western Corridor, where there is good evidence for their presence. The blocking up of the northern door would seem to indicate Squatter activity (unless it was placed there by somebody after the Squatters had abandoned the building), as would the somewhat significant amounts of BCW (0.66 kg plus 4 sherds). But did that cookware end up in the room as a result of disturbance in the Western Corridor, where we have good evidence of Squatter presence? Alternatively, must we only conclude that Squatters were in rooms that contain a good deal of evidence that can only be traced to them (coins, stamped amphora handles, BCW, and ESA)? Or is it possible that they used this room (and the bin in this room), but left no broken pot sherds behind?

---

201 CB17064
202 CB17063
203 K09T#?? (iron needle); K09T#118 (iron chisel); K09T#250 (copper alloy strip); K09L002 (stand lamp). K09T#155 (lead folded sheet); K09T#156 (iron plate); K09T#160 (carnelian bead); K09P182 (TA 129 cup rim); K09M001 (iron catapult bolt).
**Room C2 (Figure 37, Figure 38)**

Room C2 is a relatively large room (48 m$^2$). During the final phase of the PHAB this room was likely part of a dining complex that also included Rooms C3, C4, C5, C6, and C7. There is molded, painted plaster on all four walls of Room C2 and there is a fine *opus signinum* mosaic floor in Rooms C3 and C5 that probably once existed in Room C2. The doorway between Rooms C2 and C3 is preserved in the southwestern corner. Another doorway existed in the far northeastern corner (leading into the Northern Corridor) in the final phase of the PHAB.

The Squatters built two walls in the northwest corner of this room. The north/south wall reused column drums and large ashlar blocks, while the east/west wall was a rubble wall. As might be expected from Squatter walls, they are not quite perpendicular to one another, they were constructed without a foundation trench, and final-PHAB wall plaster was found between the east/west wall and the western wall of Room C2.

The southwest corner of Room C2 had a succession of floors. The highest was found underneath a Squatter-built tabun that was founded upon it (see Figure 38). The tabun had been constructed against the western wall of Room C2 and had cobbles around the perimeter of its base. The floor upon which the tabun was founded did not bond with the western wall of Room C2; instead one of the cobbles of the external ring of the tabun

---

205 Room C2 is bounded by CB35012 to the north, CB35021 to the east, CB35002/CB25003 to the south (which has been robbed down to 464.17 m. [high]/464.15 m. [low]), and CB36018 to the west.

206 Bounded by CB35012 to the north, CB35021 to the east, CB35002/CB25003 to the south (which has been robbed down to 464.17 m. [high]/464.15 m. [low]), and CB36018 to the west.

207 CB36022 (running north/south) and CB36023 (running east/west). CB36022 was removed in locus CB36010, which had an LDM of “mid-1” century BCE cookware.”

208 CB36018

209 CB35003, with a surface elevation of 464.39 m.

210 CB35001. The tabun had an internal diameter of 0.37 m. and an outside diameter of 0.42 m. Its founding elevation was 464.36 m.
had been placed between the tabun and the wall and was sitting on soil. This suggests that
the floor was Squatter-built, a proposition that is confirmed by the 0.1 m. of soil
underneath it: though the LDM in floor CB35003 was BSP and CFN, the LDM in
CB35003.1 was BCW.\textsuperscript{211} In like fashion, the LDM in tabun CB35001 was 0.18 kg of
BCW (it is worth noting that there was no Sandy Cooking Ware in this locus). All of the
sherds in the 0.3 kg of pottery from this locus were small and worn except the BCW,
which had good edges, suggesting that the BCW had not been moved or churned up
much – if at all – since it was broken.\textsuperscript{212}

The stratigraphy below floor CB35003 is a bit difficult to parse. There was soil
immediately below the floor\textsuperscript{213} that came down on floor CB35005, at 464.29 m. (see
Figure 38). Though the LDM of the lower floor was Sandy Cooking Ware and
Phoenician Semi-Fine, and the LDM of CB35005.1 (which extended down to 464.03 m.)
was Sandy Cooking Ware, some of the soil\textsuperscript{214} underneath CB35005 had an LDM of ESA
and BCW. Floor CB35006 was found floating in that soil at an elevation of 464.16 m.,
and the 0.1 m. of soil beneath it had an LDM of BCW. It is likely that this is again
evidence of two Squatter phases, as it seems unlikely that floor CB35003 was associated
with another, later tabun that was positioned nearby.\textsuperscript{215} This tabun,\textsuperscript{216} with a founding

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{211} In the spirit of full disclosure I must admit that CB35003 consisted of two patches of floor, one 2.2 x
1.15 m., the other 0.45 x 0.60 m. Nevertheless, CB35003.1 was a sealed locus.
\item \textsuperscript{212} The LDM in CB35001.1 was Sandy Cooking Ware.
\item \textsuperscript{213} K09 CB35013, CB35015 was mistakenly assigned twice – to this soil locus in 2009 and to the west wall
of Room N6 in 2010.
\item \textsuperscript{214} CB35004
\item \textsuperscript{215} CB35024. The only other floor (CB35027) was found in the northeastern corner of the room at 464.30
m. with an LDM of bricky cookware. The LDM in CB35027.1 was Spatter, Phoenician Semi-Fine, and
Sandy Cooking Ware.
\item \textsuperscript{216} CB36024
\end{itemize}
elevation of 464.66 m., was built in the doorway between Rooms C2 and C3. It was only fragmentarily preserved, but it must have been quite large, with an internal diameter of ca. 1.1 m., and it must have been built up against wall CB36018. The LDM associated with the removal of this tabun was 1st century BCE cookware, and the locus included two cookpots. That said, given the fragmentary state of preservation of this tabun (not to mention the floors in the southwest portion of this room) it is hard to believe that CB36009.1 was a truly sealed locus, and therefore the LDM should not be construed as insurmountable evidence for a post-Squatter construction date.

Above these floors were five Squatter occupation loci that were destroyed by the wall robbers. CB35011 covered tabun CB35001 (that is, the tabun was fully articulated in this locus), floor CB35003, and floor CB35005. It had an LDM of Kfar Hananya, Roman cooking ware, and Roman jar. It also had 4.0 kg (plus 7 sherds) of BCW and 0.1 kg (plus 4 sherds) of ESA. Inventoried items included an ESA cup, a BCW “kum kum” a BCW high-necked cookpot, a BCW cookpot rim, and a reused Spatter jug.

---

217 The removal of this tabun was CB36009 (464.89 m. to 464.66 m.), and CB36009.1 extended from 464.67 m. to 464.50 m.
218 Wall CB36018 was preserved to an upper elevation of 464.93 m. (high)/464.86 m. (low). The drawings also seem to indicate that there were stones and/or pottery incorporated the walls – also standard for Squatter tabuns – but the locus sheet says very little and the 2000 photos are only extant in negative format. I have not had the opportunity yet to digitize these photos.
219 CB36009.1
220 K00P196 and K00P171.
221 2009 elevations: 464.59 m. to 463.93 m.; LDM: Kfar Hananya and Roman cooking ware; 2010 elevations: 464.62 m. to 464.16 m.; LDM: Kfar Hananya and Roman jar.
222 K09P050
223 K09P188
224 K10P071 (mends with fragments from CB35010)
225 K10P074 (mends with fragments from CB35010)
226 K10P034. Other inventoried items included a lagynos neck and handle stump (K09P051), an amphoriskos toe (K09P177), an amphoriskos (K10P070), a complete intact copper spatula (K09M033), a basalt grinding stone (K10S004), 5 jar fragments (K10P034), a folded rim jug (K10P069 – fragments mend with fragments from CB35010), a baggy jar (K10P072), a lagynos (K10P073), a cast glass and a blown
The CB 3.6 NE analog to CB35011 was CB36050. It extended from 464.88 m. down to 464.30 m. and had an LDM of Roman cookware (though only one sherd from 28 kg of pottery – the next LDM was BCW).

Covering CB35011, part of floor CB35005, and floor CB35027 was CB35010, which had an LDM of Kfar Hananya, Roman cooking ware, and BCW. It extended from 464.77 m. down to 464.09 m. Six of the inventoried items from CB35011 (the folded rim jug, the BCW high-necked cookpot, the BCW cookpot rim, the amphoriskos, the baggy jar, and the lagynos) mended with fragments from CB35010. CB35010 also had 1.8 kg of BCW and 4 sherds of ESA.

Elsewhere in the trench 1.75 kg of BCW and 14 sherds of ESA were found in CB35009, which was a rubble locus with a Kfar Hananya, Roman jar, and Roman cooking ware LDM. It extended from 465.02 m. down to 464.35 m. and it covered CB35010, CB35011, and wall CB35012. A unit of CB35034 (Early Modern disturbance spanning wall CB35021) that was above Room C2 had the upper 1/3 of a high necked glass body sherd (K09T#476), a rectangular thin iron plate (K09T#579), 3 fragments of a lead strip (K09T#592), and a Phoenician Semi-Fine foot (K10T#271).

Other inventoried items from CB35010 included: 3 fragments of a copper alloy double-ended... (K09M003), a Phoenician Semi-Fine jug toe (K09P042), half of an ointment jar (K09P049), 3 fragments of a CFN saucer (K09P046), a coreform black and white perfume bottle body sherd, a clear glass body sherd, a clear blown glass vessel body sherd (K09T#349), and a tessera (K09T#351).

The CB3.6 SE analog to CB35010 was CB36045, which had a Kfar Hananya LDM and extended from 464.40 m. down to 464.68 m. It is remarkable for its almost complete lack of Squatter pottery (there were 2 sherds of BCW in CB3.6.103) and 24 inventoried items.

Other items included an intact long handled copper spatula (K09M002) and a cast glass fragment (K09T#477).

The 2009 elevations were 465.02 m. down to 464.55 m.; the 2010 elevations were 464.89 m. down to 464.47 m.
BCW cookpot. A unit of CB36002 (the “accumulation debris in the entirety of CB3.6 SE except the northwestern corner” that extended from 464.97 m. down to 464.84 m., had an LDM of Kfar Hananya, and came down on walls CB36018 and CB36022) had a coin of Antiochus VII in it. A layer of “accumulation debris” in the southeastern corner of CB3.6 SE (CB36002) had 0.01 kg ESA and an LDM: 1st century BCE cooking ware.

Finally, two pits were uncovered in Room C2. Pit CB35035 extended from 464.23 m. down to 463.93 m. and was partially covered by floor CB35027. It had an LDM of TGM, BCW, and a possible roman jar, as well as K10I002 (conical green stamp seal with “master of animals” on it); pit CB35036 had an unguentarium (K10P066). It is unlikely that they were created or used by the Squatters, especially given the great span of the material found within them (Persian-Roman). Rather, they were probably pits into which debris was swept, as was the case with the pits in Rooms E1 and E2.

**Room C3 (Figure 39)**

During the final phase of the PHAB this tiny “room” was probably some sort of foyer transition space between the Central Courtyard and the dining complex. It was bounded by CB36020 to the north, CB26003 to the east, CB26002 to the south, and CB26001 to the west. Two steps lead up from Room C3 to the Central Courtyard and a doorway in the northwest and southeast corners led into Rooms C2 and C5. The mosaic floor that was found in Room C5 continued into Room C3 and into the doorway between Rooms C3 and C2. The situation to the east, however, is completely unknown.

---

237 K10P055
238 K00C030 (136-134 BCE). Metal fragments were also found in this locus.
239 It was bounded by CB36020 to the north, CB26003 to the east, CB26002 to the south, and CB26001 to the west.
240 CB26004
Wall **CB26003**, which had an upper elevation of 464.45 m. at the northern end of Room C5, was robbed completely between Rooms C3 and C4 – down to its foundations (at 463.35 m. – mosaic floor **CB26004** had a surface elevation of 464.47 m.[high]/464.37 m.[low] – see Figure 40). All of the walls had molded and painted plaster on them.

It would seem clear that the Squatters used this room, given their presence in the Central Courtyard, Room C1, Room C2 (though, admittedly, the doorway between Rooms C2 and C3 was blocked by tabun **CB36024**), Room C5 (see below), Room C4 (see below), Room C6 (see below), and Room C7 (see below). The relative lack of material within this room, then, must be due to the small size of the room (and, consequently, its usability), as well as the extensive robbing of **CB26003** and the massive and deep disruption in Room C4 (see below).

**Room C4 (Figure 40, Figure 41, Figure 42)**

Room C4 was heavily disrupted throughout (see Figure 42). The only floor found was a poorly preserved pebble and soil floor.\(^{241}\) Patches of it were found 1 m. west of the western stylobate;\(^{242}\) west of north/south line of rocks **CB25018**\(^{243}\) it was only preserved in the southwest corner of the room. It stopped short ca. 15 cm. south of wall **CB25003** and was cut through by a layer of heavy rubble debris.\(^{244}\) The LDM of this floor was ESA (4 sherds were found among 13.3 kg [plus 16 sherds] of pottery), and the LDM in the soil underneath it was a Phoenician Semi-Fine juglet foot and BSP.\(^{245}\)

---

\(^{241}\) **CB25002**. It had a surface elevation of 464.22 m.

\(^{242}\) **CB25001**

\(^{243}\) These rocks had an LDM of a Judaean cupped rim juglet (K08P122).

\(^{244}\) **CB25017**

\(^{245}\) A small section of this floor was preserved well enough to excavate a sealed locus underneath (**CB25002.1**). This contained the Phoenician Semi-Fine juglet foot. The soil underneath the other patches of floor were excavated as **CB25014** and contained the BSP LDM.
Also found at roughly the same elevation as floor CB25002 were two ashlar paving stones and a nearby ring of stones.\textsuperscript{246} The LDM underneath them were fragments of a Cypriote incurved rim bowl and skyphos (need not be later than the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BCE). Though it is clear that the material under the paving stones is not from the Squatters, it is unclear whether these stones were Squatter-placed, in part because it is unclear when the floor of this room was destroyed. There is at least a case to be made that these stones are from the wall robbing episode, as the surface that they were sitting on was at 464.15 m. Though their surface elevation was just above that of floor CB15002 (and thus reminiscent of the ashlar in the northwest corner of the Central Courtyard that was embedded in floor CB37022, next to tabun CB37031) the soil that they were sitting on was the same as the post-robbing upper level of wall CB25003 (464.17 m. [high]/464.15 m. [low] – see Figure 42).

The soil above floor CB25002 (and covering stylobate CB25001 and wall CB25003) was CB25011,\textsuperscript{247} the LDM of which was a Broneer Type 23 lamp (dates to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE). Five sherds of BCW and a cast glass bowl rim\textsuperscript{248} were also recovered from this locus.\textsuperscript{249} Below CB25011 and floor CB25002 was massive mixed fill (CB25017), more than a meter deep, extending from 464.30 m. down to 463.18 m. It had an LDM of ESA and twenty-two inventoried objects.\textsuperscript{250}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[246] CB25015, with a bottom elevation of 464.15 m., and a surface elevation of 464.28 m.
\item[247] CB25011 extended from 464.73 m. down to 464.17 m.
\item[248] CB25017, with a bottom elevation of 464.15 m., and a surface elevation of 464.28 m.
\item[249] Other items included an iron fibula arch (K08M003), an iron net hook (K08M007), a stone weight (K08S001), a spindle whorl (K08S025), a limestone Doric capital (K08S021), a PBG rim (K08P158), an RBG rim (K08P159), an East Greek Kotyle (K08P160), an Attic Olpe (K08P161), and two stamped amphora handles, one of which was illegible (K08SAH005) and the other of which dated to 159-158 BCE (K08SAH007).
\item[250] An astragalus (K08BI004), an RBG handle with graffito on it (K08I002), an intact delphiniform lamp (K08L011), a lamp nozzle (K08L012), a mold made lamp (K08L015), a complete Phoenician Semi-Fine juglet (K08P074), an Attic bowl rim (K08P079), an Attic Black Glaze bowl rim (K08P098), an Attic Black
\end{footnotes}
This room is interesting because of its relative lack of Squatter material. The great degree of disruption in this room (and ESA LDMs down very deep) leads to a conclusion that any primary Squatter deposit has entirely disappeared. But however mixed up it might be, in the end we have the roughly the same amount of Squatter material per liter of soil as we had in the Southern room. One must question, therefore, whether the Squatters were in Room C4 at all. When was the floor of this room destroyed and rubble, pottery, and other material mixed up to such a great degree and so deeply? Is it possible that this is a sort of non-burning destruction layer that was coterminous with the abandonment of the building? In terms of patterns of travel in the building, Room C2 was entered from the doorway in the northeast corner. A tabun blocked transit into Room C3. Rooms C5 and C7 were likely entered from doorways that led into the South-Central Corridor. We have no way of knowing if there was a wall on stylobate CB25001, or whether the Stylobate Corridor was roofed. It is possible that the placement of tabuns in the building was deliberately in areas that were open to the air or immediately adjacent to them. If this is the case, then the placement of the tabun in the doorway between Rooms C2 and C3 could have been due to a lack of roof over Room C3. The same might be said for the tabun(s) in the Stylobate Corridor.

Room C5 (Figure 43, Figure 44)

To the south of Room C3 (and connected to it via a doorway in the southeastern corner of Room C3) is Room C5. Within it was the mosaic floor that was extant in Room

Glaze stamped plate (K08P099), a Phoenician Semi-Fine jug (K08P100), a Phoenician Semi-Fine jug/juglet (K08P101), a grooved rim cup (K08P120), a Persian White Ware bottle (K08P121), a painted bowl in an unknown ware (K08P226), a handstone (K08S018), a mill frame fragment (K08S004), a spindle whorl (K08S005), a Doric capital (K08S0007), a millstone (K08S019), and two RBG stamped amphora handles with oval stamps (K08SAH004 and K08SAH005).
In the southwestern corner of the room there were two rubble walls standing, one course high and one course wide that were built on top of the mosaic floor. Underneath it, in CB26023, there was a high-necked cookpot fragment, suggesting that this tiny 1.28 m² room was Squatter-built. The soil above the mosaic floor seems to confirm this interpretation. It had an LDM of ESA and included five inventoried items, two of which (a BCW cookpot that was found sitting on the floor and an ESA mastos) were Squatter (see Figure 44). The other vessel that was on the floor, a Hermon “B” jar, could possibly have belonged to the Squatters. The Hermon jar is a form and fabric that was in use in the building when it was abandoned and fragments of Hermon jars were reused in Squatter tabuns and in Squatter architecture in Room C6 (see below). The final two items, a cupped rim juglet and a fragment of an alabaster Persian vessel foot, were found in the soil above the floor (not sitting on the floor, as the other three vessels were). Covering CB36032 was a fill (CB26030) that covered the entirety of the room and had a Roman/Byzantine LDM. In it was 0.28 kg of ESA (plus 2 sherds) and BCW.

Room C6 (Figure 45)

Room C6 was originally part of the dining complex during the final PHAB phase of the building, as evidenced by the painted and molded plaster on the east face of

---

251 CB26004
252 CB26023
253 CB26032
254 K08P108
255 K08P022. Sherds from this vessel were also found in CB26032 (unit CB2.6.106b).
256 K08P046
257 K08P064
258 K08S038
259 CB26030 extended from 464.97 m. down to 464.35 m.
260 There were 8 items inventoried from this locus: a Phoenician Semi-Fine folded lamp fragment (K08L003), a delphiniform mold made lamp (K08L004), an Athenian lekythos (K08P009), two Spatter body sherds that could be imitation Cypriote (K08P010 and K08P011), an Attic cup rim (K08P018), an Attic stamped body sherd (K08P019), and a black spindle whorl (K08S003).
CB26003 and the north face of CB26025. Wall CB25024, which is an upper wall on top of wall CB25032, seems to have been built by the Squatters. Wall CB25024 extends north from the southern trench line of CB2.5 SW for approximately 1.60 m., where it abuts wall CB25055. 261 At this point CB25024 ends and the lower wall, CB25032, is robbed down to an elevation of 463.74 m. for the rest of its length until it abuts E/W wall CB25026 to the north (its uppermost elevation was 464.26 m.). BCW cookware was discovered in wall CB25024 (i.e., between the stones in the core of the wall); soil and plaster were found on top of wall CB25032 and below CB25024; and the plaster on wall CB25055 ran behind wall CB25024 but above the height of wall CB25032. 262 To the west of wall CB25024/CB25032 was a Squatter installation consisting of a pier 263 and a

261 Wall CB25055 is built on top of a lower, wider wall (CB15036). Wall CB25055 is 75 cm. thick, while the lower wall CB15036 is 90 cm. thick. Given that this is a standard phenomenon in the building for Hellenistic walls built on top of Persian walls, that stylobate CB25001 abuts CB15036, and that CB25055 is almost undoubtedly second-phase Hellenistic, I suggest that CB15036 has a Persian foundation.

262 I suggested in my final report for 2009 that wall CB25032 was an early Hellenistic-phase wall (it has column drums being reused for piers in it) that was plastered over in a late PHAB phase to turn Room C4, Room C6, and Room C7 into one room. If this is true it would account for the soil and plaster found between CB25032 and CB25024, as well as the plaster on wall CB25055 running down to the top of CB25032 (wall plaster regularly binds with floor plaster in the final PHAB phase of the building – see, e.g., the photos of the northwest corner of Room S3). Furthermore, to my knowledge this is one of only two places in the building that the Squatters built a wall on top of a PHAB wall (i.e., they put a wall in where one had collapsed or been robbed). The other place is between Room E1 and Room E3.

It at first seems strange that wall CB25024 could have been built directly on top of wall CB25032 if wall CB25032 was covered by floor CB25029 in a previous phase. However, there are two possible explanations. First, there are other places in the building in which walls were plastered over with floors and the wall is visible in spite of the floor. Secondly, there was a sink hole to the west of CB25032, where CB25032 meets CB25055, as evidenced by a sudden 21 cm. drop in the surface of floor CB25029. If that surface ran over the top of wall CB25032 (unknown because it was trenched on both sides, as explained below), the wall would have been evident. Furthermore, in the place where the floor sank we found a small pit that extended from the west face of wall CB25032 to a small patch of floor CB25029 at the western trench line, approximately 50 centimeters to the west. We also discovered a small trench, ca. 10 cm. wide and ca. 10 cm. deep, along both sides of CB25032. This trench did not cut through the lower crushed limestone floor (CB25030) on the east side of CB25032 and was very straight and clearly not the result of erosion or other random damage. It was clearly not a robbing trench (nothing had been robbed), nor a foundation trench (it was below the foundation of CB25024). I suggest, then, that the Squatters cut a tiny trench through floor CB25029 in order to delineate the line of the wall, removed some or all of the crushed limestone surface that was on top of wall CB25032, and then built CB25024. This sort of building activity is known in all phases of the building. It should be noted that at the level of the trenching activity, but in the area of the pit, we found a complete delphiniform lamp sitting horizontally on top of a large horizontal piece of a BCW cookpot.

263 CB25031
Hermon jar\textsuperscript{264} that had been broken in half and wedged between the pier and wall \textbf{CB25024}.

There were four surfaces in this area: a soil surface north of the pier (but not north of the Hermon jar),\textsuperscript{265} with a surface elevation of 464.43-464.33 m.; a soil surface south of the pier, with a surface elevation of 464.43 m.;\textsuperscript{266} a hard-packed soil surface with plaster inclusions\textsuperscript{267} against wall \textbf{CB26003} at 464.35 m.; and a crushed limestone floor below these two soil surfaces at elevations 464.17 m. (N), 464.28 m. (center), and 464.12/464.07 m. (S).\textsuperscript{268}

These surfaces were defined less by soil compaction than by the discovery of sherds, wall plaster, and a piece of worked marble\textsuperscript{269} lying horizontally. That said, the LDM of \textbf{CB25037} was BCW and TGM, while the LDM of \textbf{CB25037.1} was Phoenician Semi-Fine and Sandy Cooking Ware. The LDM of \textbf{CB25045} was BCW and TGM and the LDM of \textbf{CB25045.1} was BCW, TGM, and ESA. A coin of some sort was found in \textbf{CB25045.1}.\textsuperscript{270} Floor CB26028 had an LDM of TGM and ESA.\textsuperscript{271} Floor \textbf{CB25029} appears to be the final-PHAB floor in this area, with an LDM of LCWAM and TGM and Spatter as the LDM in \textbf{CB25029.1}. There were also two "paver slabs"\textsuperscript{272} that abutted each other and the east face of wall \textbf{CB26003} and an elevation of 464.58 m. The LDM underneath them was TGM and Local Fine.

\textsuperscript{264} CB25025/K09P030
\textsuperscript{265} CB25037
\textsuperscript{266} CB25045
\textsuperscript{267} CB26028
\textsuperscript{268} CB25029
\textsuperscript{269} K09S007, the only piece of marble found in the building.
\textsuperscript{270} K09C003. The coin conspectus has a date of 174-150 BCE, but there is no other information in the entry.
\textsuperscript{271} There was no \textbf{CB26028.1}. This locus also included a bead (K08BD003)
\textsuperscript{272} CB26024
The soil\textsuperscript{273} above floors \textbf{CB25037} and \textbf{CB25045} included 0.16 kg of BCW and 3 sherds of ESA. A further 0.14 kg of BCW and 1 sherd of ESA was recovered from the soil in the robbing trench over the northern section of \textbf{CB25032}. In addition, the soil\textsuperscript{274} associated with Squatter use in this room had 0.16 kg of BCW. The soil\textsuperscript{275} above floor \textbf{CB26028} included two mostly whole vessels, a BCW cookpot\textsuperscript{276} and a Phoenician Semi-Fine jug.\textsuperscript{277} The soil\textsuperscript{278} above that, with a Kfar Hananya LDM, included most of a BCW high-necked cookpot,\textsuperscript{279} a BCW cooking pot lid,\textsuperscript{280} and a coin of Antiochus VII.\textsuperscript{281}

It is unknown whether wall \textbf{CB25024} continued north all the way to wall \textbf{CB25026/CB26027}. At some point wall \textbf{CB25032}, and perhaps wall \textbf{CB25024}, was/were robbed north of the northern end of \textbf{CB25024}, down to an elevation of 463.60 m. Though some robbing activity in the building might be attributable to the Squatter phase (they needed stones to build walls too), the proximity of the wall robbing in CB 2.5 SW and SE to known Squatter installations suggests that the robbing must be later. The Squatter surfaces that are so prominent to the east and west of both wall \textbf{CB25024} and installations \textbf{CB25031} and \textbf{CB25025} are missing in the line of wall \textbf{CB25032} where it

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{CB25046}: The units in \textbf{CB25046} were locused together as wall robbing disruption of Squatter deposits throughout CB 2.5. The following units belong in the following rooms: In Room C7: CB2.5.107; CB2.5.110; CB2.5.112; CB2.5.117; CB2.5.131; CB2.5.140. In Room C6: CB2.5.105; CB2.5.109; CB2.5.111; CB2.5.118; CB2.5.119; CB2.5.122; CB2.5.129. Units over the robbed northern section of CB25032: CB2.5.108; CB2.5.116; CB2.5.118; CB2.5.120. Stylobate Corridor: CB2.5.157; CB2.5.158; CB2.5.159; CB2.5.160; CB2.5.161; CB2.5.170; CB2.5.175; CB2.5.187. CB2.5.177 was the upper layer of soil in tabun CB25041 (east of the eastern stylobate); CB2.5.168 was at the northern end of the eastern stylobate.
  \item \textbf{CB25047}: The units in \textbf{CB25047} were locused together as Squatter use units throughout CB2.5 SW. The following units belong in the following rooms: In Room C7: CB1.5.136; CB2.5.239. In Room C6: CB2.5.125; CB2.5.126; CB2.5.127.
  \item \textbf{CB26038}
  \item \textbf{K08P049}
  \item \textbf{K08P050}
  \item \textbf{CB26037}
  \item \textbf{K08P020}
  \item \textbf{K08C008} (134-133 BCE)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{273} Three other items were inventoried in this locus: a Local Fine delphiniform lamp (\textbf{K08L005}), a Local Fine or TGM ring foot (\textbf{K08P082}), and a stone pendant (\textbf{K08S012}).
has been robbed. Indeed, there was nothing but rubble in the area north of **CB25024** down to the robbed portion of **CB25032**. The soil associated with this activity had LDMs of BCW cookware and TGM.\(^{282}\)

**Room C7 (Figure 45)**

Two surfaces were discovered in Room C7: a crushed limestone floor with a surface elevation of 464.25 m\(^{283}\) and a crushed limestone floor with a surface elevation of 464.07 m.\(^{284}\) (Stylobate **CB25001**’s surface was at an elevation of 464.34-464.29 m.) Immediately above the upper crushed limestone floor (**CB25027**) we found very compact soil which was burnt in one area, next to which we found a ca. 15 cm. x 8 cm. x 1 cm. trace of tabun. The soil\(^{285}\) above floor **CB25027** had more than 0.07 kg of BCW and significant amounts of wall plaster; the soil\(^{286}\) associated with Squatter use in this room had a further 0.1kg (plus 2 sherds) of BCW.

**The South-Central Corridor (Figure 46)**

The South-Central Corridor is the avenue of congress between the Central Courtyard and the Stylobate Corridor. It is open (or there were doorways) to the east and

---

\(^{282}\) **CB25051**
\(^{283}\) **CB25027**
\(^{284}\) **CB25030**

\(^{285}\) **CB25046** The units in **CB25046** were locussed together as wall robbing disruption of Squatter deposits throughout CB 2.5. The following units belong in the following rooms: **In Room C7**: CB2.5.107; CB2.5.110; CB2.5.112; CB2.5.117; CB2.5.131; CB2.5.140. **In Room C6**: CB2.5.105; CB2.5.109; CB2.5.111; CB2.5.118; CB2.5.119; CB2.5.122; CB2.5.129. **Units over the robbed northern section of CB25032**: CB2.5.108; CB2.5.116; CB2.5.118; CB2.5.120. **Stylobate Corridor**: CB2.5.157; CB2.5.158; CB2.5.159; CB2.5.160; CB2.5.161; CB2.5.170; CB2.5.175; CB2.5.187. CB2.5.177 was the upper layer of soil in tabun CB25041 (east of the eastern stylobate); CB2.5.168 was at the northern end of the eastern stylobate.

\(^{286}\) **CB25047** The units in **CB25047** were locussed together as Squatter use units throughout CB2.5 SW. The following units belong in the following rooms: **In Room C7**: CB1.5.136; CB2.5.239. **In Room C6**: CB2.5.125; CB2.5.126; CB2.5.127.
west. Within it a floor was uncovered\textsuperscript{287} with a surface elevation of 464.35 m./464.43 m.\textsuperscript{288} Drain \textbf{CB16009} ran in the western portion of the corridor, draining the southeastern corner of the Central Courtyard. The top of the capstones was at 464.59 m.

The soil above the floor was subsoil,\textsuperscript{289} which in CB1.5 NW had 6 sherds of BCW and 0.055 kg (plus 3 sherds) of ESA. Six body sherds and a handle of BCW was also found in a fill in the northeastern corner of CB1.5 NW;\textsuperscript{290} another sherd was recovered from the robber’s trench over wall \textbf{CB15023}.\textsuperscript{291} The small amount of Squatter material in this area makes sense, given that it is a corridor that runs between two known-Squatter-use areas (the Central Courtyard and the Stylobate Corridor).

\textbf{The Stylobate Corridor (Figure 47)}

The Stylobate Corridor is bounded on the west by stylobate \textbf{CB25001} and on the east by stylobate \textbf{CB25007/CB15021}. North of the point where \textbf{CB25001} ends, wall \textbf{CB35021} forms the western boundary of the Stylobate Corridor and the area to the east is unexcavated. At the northern end of the Stylobate Corridor there is a doorway and threshold that is effectively an eastern extension of the southern wall of the Northern Corridor.\textsuperscript{292}

Between the stylobates two (or three?) surfaces were uncovered. Moving from north to south they are: a pebbly plaster floor\textsuperscript{293} with a surface elevation of 464.31 m. in CB3.5 SE that abutted wall \textbf{CB35021} and the doorway into the Northern Entrance; a

\textsuperscript{287} \textbf{CB15029/CB16053}

\textsuperscript{288} The LDM in \textbf{CB16053} was BSP; the LDM in \textbf{CB16053.1} was Classical Black Slip, Phoenician Semi-Fine, and Spatter. Floor \textbf{CB15029} was not excavated.

\textsuperscript{289} \textbf{CB15001} and \textbf{CB16037}

\textsuperscript{290} \textbf{CB15025}

\textsuperscript{291} \textbf{CB15026}

\textsuperscript{292} \textbf{CB35012}

\textsuperscript{293} \textbf{CB35028}
beaten-earth floor\textsuperscript{294} at elevations 464.31-464.29 m. in CB2.5 SE; and a crushed limestone floor\textsuperscript{295} that covered the entire area between the stylobates at an elevation of 464.12 m. in CB2.5 SE, at an elevation of 464.05 m. in CB2.5 NE, and at an elevation of 464.35 m. (high)/464.02 m. (low) in CB1.5 NE and NW. \textbf{CB35028} had an LDM of Roman Jar and 1 sherd of ESA in it (there was no \textsuperscript{CB35028.1});\textsuperscript{296} \textbf{CB25006} had 3 sherds of ESA in it;\textsuperscript{297} \textbf{CB25034} had an LDM of ESA;\textsuperscript{298} \textbf{CB15029} was not excavated.

The soil on top of these floors yielded far less Squatter material than was expected, given the Squatter features in the Stylobate Corridor (see below). The Early Modern disturbance\textsuperscript{299} that was on the east and west sides of wall \textbf{CB35021} and covered floor \textbf{CB35028} yielded good Squatter pottery on the west side of the wall but far less on the east side.\textsuperscript{300} The soil locus on top of floor \textbf{CB25006}\textsuperscript{301} had only 0.02 kg of ESA and the locus on top of floor \textbf{CB25034},\textsuperscript{302} had only 0.01 kg of BCW.

The only features uncovered within the Stylobate corridor were a tabun\textsuperscript{303} and a Coastal Orange Ware jar\textsuperscript{304} buried upside-down and reused for an unknown purpose (perhaps also as a tabun – the fabric of the jar was discolored to a pinkish color, possibly

\textsuperscript{294} \textbf{CB25033}, N.b.: \textbf{CB25033} was over \textbf{CB25034}

\textsuperscript{295} \textbf{CB25034/CB25006/CB15029}. Part of \textbf{CB25006} was excavated as “contaminated floor,” as its fragmentary nature made it impossible to excavate cleanly. This locus (\textbf{CB25014}) yielded an LDM of Ras al-Fuqra, Roman jar, and Roman cooking ware, as well as a pierced lead weight (\textsuperscript{K08M036}).

\textsuperscript{296} \textbf{CB35028} also had an imported grey ware lamp (\textsuperscript{K10L014}), 4 fragments of a mold made bowl (\textsuperscript{K10P060}), and 2 joining fragments of a bone hinge (\textsuperscript{K10BI005}), as well as an iron spike fragment (\textsuperscript{K10T#522}) and 4 chert blades (\textsuperscript{K10T#523}).

\textsuperscript{297} As well as an Attic red figure body sherd (\textsuperscript{K06P190}), and Attic Black Glaze rim (\textsuperscript{K06P191}), and ESA mold made bowl fragments (\textsuperscript{K06P192}), \textsuperscript{CB25006.1} had an LDM of CFN.

\textsuperscript{298} \textsuperscript{CB35034}\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{CB25034.1}} had an LDM of Sandy Cooking Ware.

\textsuperscript{299} \textsuperscript{CB35034}\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{CB25034.1}} had an LDM of Sandy Cooking Ware.

\textsuperscript{300} Five sherds of BCW were found in east side units, plus another 3 sherds of BCW and 1 sherd of ESA in units cleaning and defining the top of the wall.

\textsuperscript{301} \textsuperscript{CB25020}

\textsuperscript{302} \textsuperscript{CB25046} The units from \textsuperscript{CB25046} that were over the Stylobate Corridor were CB2.5.157, CB2.5.158, CB2.5.159, CB2.5.160, CB2.5.161, CB2.5.170, CB2.5.175, \textsuperscript{CB25004}

\textsuperscript{303} \textsuperscript{CB25005}
due to the heat associated with its use as a tabun. See Figure 48.) The rim of the Coastal Orange Ware jar seems to have been purposefully broken off, as it was cleanly broken and was not found inside or under the jar. Both features were sitting on floor CB25006. CB25004 and had an LDM of BSP, while CB25005 had a Spatter Ware everted rim bowl, Local Fine, Phoenician Semi-Fine, and Sandy Cooking Ware inside of it.

Stylobate CB25007 has a depression cut into the eastern half of two of the stones (it looks like the threshold to a doorway, going up as one proceeds from east to west) that is between tabun CB25041 in the south and pier installation CB25035 in the north. At some point – probably in the Squatter phase – this doorway cut into stylobate CB25007 was filled with cobbles and a pier and cobble installation was built on top of the wall that is immediately east of stylobate CB25007 and north of tabun CB25041. The tops of the cobbles were at approximately the same elevation as the cobbles in the pier installation.

As noted earlier, the rim, neck, and part of the shoulders of one Rhodian amphora, the stamps of which date to 145 BCE, could also have belonged to the Squatters. It was found sitting upright in the middle of the Stylobate corridor, in early modern fill that covers floor CB35028. However, it is equally possible that the upper portion of a Rhodian amphora from the PHAB (or from somewhere outside of the PHAB) was discovered and reused in the Early Modern period. This would explain both the

\[305\] Depression: 464.03 m.; stylobate: 464.12-464.07 m.
\[306\] CB25038
\[307\] CB25035
\[308\] CB25026/CB24009
\[309\] 464.10 m.
\[310\] K10P011
\[311\] K10SAH001 and K01SAH002
\[312\] CB35034
height of the rim and handles above the floor and the absence of the bottom portion of the amphora.

**Room E1 (Figure 49)**

A small (0.50 x 0.60 m.) pit cut into the plaster floor in this room. With the exception of one small sherd of Roman cooking ware that was found near the top, nothing need date later than the middle of the 2nd century BCE. The excavation of the pit, initially designated CB24023, was continued in 2000 as CB24035, from 463.92 m. down to 463.71 m. This locus had an Augustan lamp fragment for an LDM, as well as 11 coins, 11 lamp fragments, and a further 7 inventoried items, including 2 bullae.

The great number of coins that were found very deep, combined with the clear Early
Roman LDM, also from very deep levels, suggests that this pit was dug by the Squatters (or perhaps by the PHAB inhabitants, but this requires an explanation for why a pit would have been dug through the floor) and filled by those who robbed the walls. It is important to note that these walls were likely robbed over hundreds, if not thousands, of years, and the pit in Room E2 contains a coin of Constans I (341-346 CE) in the same locus as a piece of the Terra Nigra saucer that comes from this pit. Why were so many Squatter-era coins found mixed in with Early Roman debris at the bottom of the pit? The same situation occurred in a pit in Room E2 and might suggest that a small coin hoard had been inadvertently swept into the pit with other debris. There is, of course, no way to prove this, but it is interesting that coin hoards are usually evidence of sudden abandonment and that there is other evidence of sudden Squatter abandonment – for instance, the tabun in the Northern Corridor was found with a Squatter cookpot still in it. Another option is that the coins were swept into the pit at such a late date (e.g., the Byzantine period) that they were corroded and not recognized as coins (or not recognized as coins of value).

Another small, irregularly shaped pit (0.10-0.40 x 1 m.) was found in the southeastern corner of Room E1. It too contained an extremely dense concentration of broken pottery (19.74 kg of pottery in 300 L of soil). Parts of the pit were found underneath floor CB24008, and it is unclear whether the pit was cut through the floor and

---

K00C036 (128-127 BCE); K00C039 (126-125 BCE); K00C035 (126-123 BCE); K00C040 (126-123 BCE); and K00C038 (116-88 BCE). The two bullae came from the unit below that (CB2.4.194, dug from 462.58 m. down to 462.48 m.).

CB2.4.192 had an LDM of Roman Cooking Ware and included 6 fish plate fragments; CB2.4.193 had an LDM of Roman Cooking Ware and included 16 red slip fish plate fragments, ESA sherds that mended with a Hayes Form 18 hemispherical bowl, 5 fragments of Pompeiian Red Ware (K00P025) and a Roman cookpot fragment. The Augustan lamp fragment that provided the LDM for the entire locus came from CB2.4.207, which was dug from 462.95 m. down to 462.71 m.

---

CB24024
was bell-shaped or the floor was laid over the top of the pit. The LDM of the pit is one sherd of an ESA jar, but other than this sherd none of the pottery need be later than the middle of the 2nd century BCE. As with pit CB24023, pit CB24024 had an inverted stratigraphy. The upper units had LDMs from the Iron Age and Persian period, while only the deepest unit had pottery that dated to the beginning of the 2nd century BCE.

**Room E2 (Figure 50)**

As with Room E1, the southern wall consisted of one wall (CB24004, preserved from 463.67 m. down to 463.22 m.) that was built on top of another (CB24005, preserved from 463.27 m. down to its foundation at 462.71 m.), with soil in between (CB24004.1). CB24004, ca. 0.70 m. wide and 0.20 m. high, had Byzantine and Roman pottery for its LDM, which makes sense given that the soil within Room E4 at this elevation had Roman LDMs. The sealed soil underneath the wall (CB24004.1), however, had an ESA Hayes Form 20 bowl and Parthian Green Glaze sherds as its LDM.

It is likely that the eastern wall of this room is also Squatter-built. It has not been excavated, so this is impossible to know. However, it has the same poor rubble construction as other Squatter-built walls and is not quite straight.

No floor was discovered in this room. However, a bell-shaped pit was discovered in the middle of it. It included several large fragments of painted plaster. Some of the pottery fragments from this pit join with vessels from the pit in Room E1 (pit

---

322 Room E2 is bounded by wall CB24006 on the north, CB23001 on the east, CB24004/CB24005 on the south, and CB24007 on the west.

323 CB24033
It included 13 coins, a glass rod, a complete lamp, two other lamp fragments and a lamp tube, a bronze ring, a bronze pin, an iron inlay, an iron projectile point, two bowls, a grinder, a stone basin, an unfired loomweight, and pieces of the terra nigra saucer found in the pit in Room E1.

**Room E3 (Figure 51)**

Room E3 has only been partially excavated (see Figure 4). Four surfaces were discovered just east of stylobate **CB25007**: a beaten-earth surface at elevations 464.19-464.05 m. (**CB25039**) with an LDM of ESA and BCW in **CB25029.1**; a crushed limestone floor (**CB25040**) below **CB25039** at elevation 463.98 m. with an LDM of ESA in **CB25040.1**. **CB25040** was an upper laminate for an earlier crushed limestone floor at elevation 463.91 m. (**CB25042/CB24044**); this relative stratigraphy was made apparent by

---

---

324 In order of date, they were: Antiochus III – 199-188 BCE (K00C015); Seleucid, 2nd century BCE (K00C010); Autonomous Akko-Ptolemais – 140-132 BCE (K00C012); Antiochus VII – 136-135 BCE (K00C011); Antiochus VII – 135-134 BCE (K00C008); Antiochus VII – 135-134 BCE (K00C002); Antiochus VII – 135-134 BCE (K00C020); Antiochus VII – 134-133 BCE (K00C003); Demetrius II, 2nd reign – 129-126 BCE (K00C005); Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII – 126-125 BCE (K00C004); Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII – 126-125 BCE (K00C009); Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII – 126-123 BCE (K00C013); and Constans I – 341-346 CE (K00C014).
325 K00G005
326 K00L003
327 1 grayware lamp fragment (K00L007) and 1 other lamp fragment (K00L008). The lamp tube was K00L008.
328 K00M036
329 K00M037
330 K00M038
331 K00M040
332 K00P041 and K00P237
333 K00S001
334 K00S026
335 K00TC003
336 K00P025. Much more was found that was not inventoried, such as more than 86 fragments of painted wall plaster, various metal fragments, Hellenistic and Roman pottery, nails, and mud brick.
337 It is bounded by **CB24009/CB25036/CB24005/CB24010** to the north (see the description of this wall under Room E1), **CB24001** to the east, an unexcavated baulk to the south, and stylobate **CB25007** to the west.
CB25042 had an LDM of BCW. Below floor CB25042/CB24044 was another crushed limestone floor at elevation 463.87 m. (CB25043/CB24045).  

Tabun CB25041 (upper elevation: 464.24 m.; bottom of the inside: 463.97 m.) was constructed against the north side of wall (or, perhaps, pier) CB25057, the upper elevation of which was at 464.25 m. This pier and the stones around it were excavated in the last days of the season and only the top is exposed. It is unknown whether this was constructed as part of the tabun installation or if the tabun was built up against a preexisting wall (however, it should be noted that the pier is directly west of and in line with wall CB25002). The tabun cut through floor CB25042. Floor CB25040, the upper crushed limestone floor, was then laid over the top of CB25042 and against the tabun wall stones (see Figure 53). In the area where the tabun cuts through CB25042, floor CB25040 is nothing more or less than an upper laminate sealing to the tabun wall stones.

The soil under tabun CB25041 (i.e., CB25041.1) had an LDM of Late Hellenistic red-slipped fineware.

To the north of tabun CB25041 and to the east of stylobate CB25007 was a Squatter installation consisting of a pier and some surrounding cobbles that sits on top of a lower wall that abuts stylobate CB25007 from the east. There is a small

---

338 Plaster floor CB24044 was excavated in the eastern part of the room and had a surface elevation of 464.04 m. (high)/463.93 m. (low). It must be contemporary with CB25042 (given that it was cut by the tabun and CB25040 was simply an upper laminate of CB25042). It had a Phoenician Semi-Fine flanged-rim juglet for an LDM and CB25044.1 contained nothing that need be later than Persian.

339 Plaster floor CB24045 was excavated in the eastern part of the room and had a surface elevation of 463.90 m. (high)/463.84 m. (low). As such it must be the same floor as CB25043. CB24045 had an LDM of Local Fine and the LDM in the fill beneath it (CB24046) the LDM was also Local Fine.

340 CB25035 – top of pier: 464.56 m.; cobbles: 464.03 m.; stones to north and south of the cobbles: 464.24 m.

341 CB25036
foundation trench for a row of cobblestones to the south of the pier that fill the space between the pier and the floor that was to the south of it, probably CB25042 (stones: 464.05 m.; floor: 464.00 m.).

South of wall CB25057 (which sits against the south side of tabun CB25041) is a cobble surface of some sort (CB25058/CB15031) at 464.17 m. and a patchy, degraded crushed limestone surface (CB25059/CB15030) at 464.11 m.

**Room E4 (Figure 52)**

Room E4 is perhaps the least interesting room in the entire building. The upper portion of the northern wall of the room is known to be a Squatter wall, but it is important to note that it was installed over the top of CB24001. It did not reach to wall CB24003 in the state of preservation in which it was found when excavated.

Within this room an extremely hard-packed layer of yellow brown soil that was deemed to be a (potential) floor. The soil underneath it had an Early Roman LDM that included a coin of Demetrius I’s first reign (144-143 BCE). The northern wall of the room was also underneath this Early Roman fill. Everything else that was excavated from this room dated to the early 2nd century BCE, 3rd century BCE, or Persian period with the exception of the sub-subsoil rubble that covered the tops of the walls. Within this locus, which had an LDM of two Arab smudge ware sherds, there was a coin of

---

342 CB25056
343 It is bounded by wall CB24004/CB24005 to the north (see the explanation of this wall under Room E2); CB24003 to the east; CB24002 to the south, and CB24001 to the west.
344 CB24004
345 CB24016, at 464.30 m.
346 CB24015, K99C022
347 CB24013
Antiochus III (222-187 BCE),\textsuperscript{348} a coin of Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII (126-125 BCE),\textsuperscript{349} an Erotes lamp,\textsuperscript{350} a Persian White Ware krater or basin rim and bowl,\textsuperscript{351} an overhanging rim krater in cookpot fabric,\textsuperscript{352} a PBG jar or bowl rim,\textsuperscript{353} a Sandy or Gritty Cooking Ware necked flattened-rim cookpot,\textsuperscript{354} a Sandy Cooking Ware neckless triangular rim cookpot,\textsuperscript{355} a spindle whorl,\textsuperscript{356} and a carnelian bead.\textsuperscript{357} This locus is clearly far from any primary context.

**The Northeastern Corridor (Figure 55)**

Stylobate \textbf{CB25007} continues north into the NE quadrant of CB 2.5, where it appears to have been robbed at the north end. In place of the remaining stylobate there were cobbles that appeared to be rubble, though more or less in line with the stylobate, at elevation 464.29 m. (the stylobate is at 464.14 m. here). They were sitting on soil, and so removed, and underneath the soil layer there were more cobbles, at an elevation of 463.97-463.85 m.\textsuperscript{358} On the east and west sides of stylobate \textbf{CB25007}, and north of pier installation \textbf{CB25035}, there are two crushed limestone surfaces.\textsuperscript{359} The rest of the Northeastern Corridor has not been excavated.

\textsuperscript{348} K99C003
\textsuperscript{349} K99C004
\textsuperscript{350} K99L001
\textsuperscript{351} K99P102 and K99P103
\textsuperscript{352} K99P100
\textsuperscript{353} K99P104
\textsuperscript{354} K99P105
\textsuperscript{355} K99P101
\textsuperscript{356} K99S008
\textsuperscript{357} K99BD001
\textsuperscript{358} CB25053
\textsuperscript{359} CB25054, at 464.15 m., on the east and \textbf{CB25006}, at 464.05 m., on the west.
The Eastern Corridor (Figure 54)

The Eastern Corridor has not been excavated very deeply. It is bounded by CB14005/CB24003/CB23001 to the west and CB13001/CB23002 to the east. There is a wall stublet (CB23003) just east of CB24004/CB24005 that is not perpendicular to the other walls. It had an upper elevation of 463.33 m. and CB23003.1 had an LDM of Phoenician Semi-Fine. There was 1 sherd of BCW and 1 sherd of ESA in subsoil and 2 sherds of BCW in the robbing trench over the intersection of CB23002 and CB23008.

Though a lack of pottery suggests that this area was not used by the Squatters, it is a corridor (and therefore unlikely to have a lot of material) and is immediately east of known Squatter-used areas.
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The Northern Rooms (Rooms N3, N4, N6 and the Northern Entrance – Figure 55)

There is virtually no evidence of Squatter presence in Rooms N3 and N4. Though there was some residual Squatter material in Room N4, it was entirely confined to topsoil, subsoil, and wall robbing phases. Perhaps more interesting is the almost complete lack of Squatter material in Room N3, because the Squatters used the Northern Corridor and the rooms to the south of it (e.g., Room C1), and during the Squatter phase there was no wall dividing the Northern Corridor from Room N3 (the plaster floor of room Room N3 continues over the wall that divides it from the Northern Corridor, and is the same floor that was found in the Northern Corridor). There is one other area of the building that shares these characteristics: Room S8, which was an open-air area (see below). Given the length of room Room N3 and the presence of the drain

---

360 ESA: CB46009 (subsoil/rubble – 1 fragment); CB46010 (continued rubble – a Hayes 22A bottom; 20 g. of ES?); CB46011 (a fill that came down on the robbed northern wall of the building and extended slightly below it on the north and south – a Tel Anafa type 16 ESA dish [K00P142] and an ESA fragment); CB46016 (a deep locus in Room N4 that bound pit CB46008 – two coins of Demetrius II [145-140]. CB46016 was dug quickly and pit CB46008 is a post-excavation locus that was assigned on the basis of examination of the southern baulk. It was not found during excavation, cuts through both floors, and was likely part of the Early Roman wall robbing episode. Its upper elevation is 464.80, which is well above the lower elevation of the rubble locus CB46010).

361 There were seven body sherds of BCW and no ESA found in the entirety of CB4.6SE: three in CB46021 (topsoil and subsoil), and four in CB46022 (the robbing trench of the north wall of the building that lies directly beneath subsoil and touches the robbing trench of wall CB46002).
going out of it through the north wall of the building, it seems likely that this room was unroofed in the final phase of the building as well.

There is also virtually no evidence for the Squatters in Room N6 and the Northern Entrance. A cast glass bowl rim and 10 fragments of an ESA bowl were found in a pit (CB35016) that was cut through the fallen mud brick in Room N6 and which had an Early Roman LDM. Aside from this there was no other indication of Squatter use of these rooms.

**The Northwestern Rooms (Rooms N1 and N2 – Figure 56)**

Rooms N1 and N2 were only accessible from the south, and while the Northern Corridor ends at the eastern wall of Room N2, there was no entrance to that room from the east. It is clear that the Squatters did not use Room N1 (the so-called “archive room”) because it was burned prior to the building going out of use (see below). The blocking of the southern doorway of Room N2 (the only doorway into this room) that was found *in situ* (see Figure 25) shows that the Squatters did not use this room, either. The presence of known markers of the Squatters (ESA and BCW) is entirely confined to topsoil, subsoil, and high-elevation disturbed areas.

Sometime around the time of the building’s abandonment two babies were buried on top of the floor of the archive room (Room N1). At some point afterwards the room

---

362 CB46020
363 K10G002
364 K10P027
365 CB 4.7: ESA was found in four loci (seventeen units): CB47000 (topsoil); CB47008 (subsoil); CB47009 (upper-level fill with a Kfar Hananya type 4A LDM); and CB47012 (disturbed pink mudbrick fill – one ESA rim). BCW was either not found or not recognized in 1999 – there is no recorded BCW in CB 4.7. CB 4.8: ESA was found in four loci (four units): CB48006 (subsoil); CB48020 (subsoil); CB48021 (“subsoil” on unit sheet; “light brown decayed mudbrick” on locus sheet. The unit in question is CB48021 and the ESA is K00P133, sent for NAA). A cast glass rim was found in CB48026 (unit CB4.8.156), which is the locus for the plaster and sherd floor in Room N1, and another piece of cast glass was found in CB48024 (the ash/burn locus that included bullae).
was set afire, and the doorway to the south was blocked. The door block between Rooms W1 and N1 had a painted plaster fragment amongst the stones and the soil underneath the stones had a cast glass bowl body sherd.\(^{366}\)

The interpretation of the abandonment and destruction of this room is difficult. If we assume that this room was intentionally burned because of the presence of the archive within it, then we have a few historical parallels that might explain the motive. On the one hand, Jonathan’s defeat of Demetrius effectively established Antiochus VI and Tryphon as being in control of the Palestinian interior, including Galilee and Syria, as Jonathan was acting as an agent of Antiochus (see chapter 4 for a more full discussion). Assuming that the forced abandonment and partial destruction of the administrative building at Kedesh is indicative of the administrators leaving the city (i.e., that the administrators did not relocate to another part of the city, which seems likely), then Jonathan’s defeat of Demetrius would probably have accomplished the annexation of the Tyrian hinterland and the city of Kedesh to Antiochus VI’s control. There are three models that might explain the burning of the archive room under these circumstances: Jonathan’s army burned the archive, Demetrius’ army (or agents) burned the archive, or the people of Kedesh burned the archive.

Though palaces and archives are often burnt when a city is destroyed in times of war (see, e.g., Cicero, *For Archias* 4.8 for the example of Heracleus), the only examples that I know of in which a newly occupying force explicitly and intentionally burning an archive are the Romans’ burning of the Jerusalem archive (*War* 6.354) and Alexander the Great’s burning of the Persepolis archives, a deed that is variously explained in the sources as revenge for the Persian destruction of the Athenian acropolis and/or a

\(^{366}\) K00T#1968.
drunken challenge. Is it possible that the destruction of temples and palaces in antiquity was understood to include the destruction of archives within them – to the degree that the destruction of the archive is not mentioned and is assumed by ancient authors to go hand-in-hand and not deserve mention? I don’t know. In Alexander’s case, neither explanation of motive seems particularly satisfactory – Alexander’s usual modus operandus was to legitimately occupy the throne of kingdoms that he conquered (something that he apparently literally did in the four months that Arrian said that he was in Persepolis), not to destroy it. And although Arrian reports that he drank a lot, there is no example of it affecting policy like this. We could come up with reasons that Jonathan/Antiochus might want to destroy an archive if they were annexing an administrative center to Antiochus’ kingdom, but we could also come up with reasons that they would not (e.g., tax records or records of land deeds make taxing the population easier, etc.). Without knowing what sort of archive this was it is difficult to know what the motivation might have been.

On the other hand, it is possible that Demetrius or one of his agents burned the archive in order to keep the occupying forces from getting their hands on them. Philip VI sent a hypaspist to Lysias to burn his correspondence so that the Romans would not acquire it (Polybius 18.33.1ff; Livy 33.11; cf. Polybius 30.4). In this case Philip acts in order to protect others who had supported him, but if the archive was burned by Demetrius in order to keep the Hasmonaeans from acquiring its contents it would not require that there was a conspiracy afoot.

Another option is that the people of Kedesh burned the archive in order to destroy any record of required tax payments, as the rebels did in Jerusalem did during the Roman siege of the city (War 2.426-427), and as apparently happened in Rome in 7 BCE (Dio
55.8.5-6) and in Antioch in 70 CE (War 7.54-62). Two other archives are known to have been burnt during some sort of unrest, and it is possible, though unconfirmed, that it happened for these reasons. The βιβλιοθήκη δηµοσίων λόγων in the city of Mendes-Thmouis in the central Delta region of Egypt was found with rooms of burnt papyri. It has been suggested that the destruction happened during the Bucolic revolt in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. In like fashion, perhaps, the archive at Dyme in Achaea was intentionally burned in either 115 or 144 BCE during “unrest,” according to the inscription of Q Fabius Maximus. The reason for the burning is not stated in the inscription, and arguments have been made both for and against debt-cancellation as a motive.

However, the fact that the relative stratigraphy included soil on top of the floor and vessels, the two infant skeletons on top of the soil (but bullae underneath them), ash on top of the soil and the burials, and mud brick wall collapse on top of the ash suggest that the abandonment, burials, and burning of the archive room were not coterminous. The only access to the archive room was through all of the western rooms (i.e., the archive room had one door that opened into Room W1, which had one door opening to the south, into Room W3, etc.). As a result, the archive room was effectively deep in the recesses of the building. The most likely interpretation (i.e., the one that makes sense of

---

367 See W. E. H. Cockle, "State Archives in Graeco-Roman Egypt from 30 BC to the Reign of Septimus Severus," JEA 70 (1984), 106-122. The reference to the burning of the archive is in lines 6-7 and 22. 368 P. P. Dobree, "Greek Inscriptions from the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge," CJ 30 (1824), 127-129. For the argument that the inscription should be dated to 144 BCE instead of 115 BCE, as has traditionally been the case, as well as for a full bibliography of places that the inscription has been published and commented on, see Robert Kallet-Marx, "Quintus Fabius Maximus and the Dyme Affair (Syll. 684)," CQ 45, no. 1 (1995), 129-153. 369 E.g., A. Fuks, "Social Revolution in Dyme, 116-114 B.C.E.," Scripta Hierosolymitana 23 (1972), 21-27. Contra: Kallet-Marx, "Quintus Fabius Maximus and the Dyme Affair (Syll. 684)," 148ff. For a list of authors who have interpreted the inscription as social-revolutionary struggle against Roman-sponsored oligarchs, see Kallet-Marx, "Quintus Fabius Maximus and the Dyme Affair (Syll. 684)." 148 n. 99
all of the evidence) is that the archive room sat abandoned, after which the two infants were buried in the room. The door of the room was blocked up, and perhaps this is when the other doors along the north-south axis (i.e., the western rooms) were also blocked. To the degree that we can tell, all of these rooms seem to show the same degree of abandonment before their doors were blocked, and it is possible that this strange action of blocking successive doors along the north-south corridor of rooms had the effect of burying the two corpses deeply. The burial of bodies in a building (as opposed to outside the city) might seem strange, but it is known from Jerusalem during the time of the siege by the Romans (War 6.355). These were, of course, unusual circumstances in which the siege caused a famine that increased the body count, as well as prohibiting the burial of bodies outside the city. The Temple Scroll from Qumran makes reference to the Gentiles burying their dead “everywhere…even within their houses,” and burial in abandoned buildings is known from much later periods in other parts of the Mediterranean and Middle East.

370 11QT 48:11-13. The burial of dead underneath the floors of houses is also known from Seleucia on the Tigris.
371 Purportedly at Zar Tepe in the Kushan and post-Kushan periods (1st century BCE-3rd century CE): see Encyclopaedia Iranica: Excavations III. In Central Asia: Kushan and Post-Kushan Archaeology. In Late Antique Spain: “The reuse of structural remains as burial places is a significant break with practice before Late Antiquity… In the past it was generally assumed that the existence of burial automatically implied that the buildings were already abandoned; now, however, knowledge about post-Roman funerary practices permits us to supposed that, at least in some cases, there was a possible cohabitation between the dead and the living (hence examples above show habitational reuse plus burials).’’ See Christie, Landscapes of Change: Rural Evolutions in Late Antique and The Early, 81ff. In Late Antique North Africa: “Thus in the fifth century abandoned buildings sometimes quickly became receptacles for burial, particularly if they were conveniently located near inhabited areas. This pattern for small plots of graves, or isolated burials, being found near inhabited areas, either inside abandoned buildings or simply in a semi-isolated cluster, is sustained in North African settings, becoming even more common in the sixth and seventh century. Therefore, at Tabarka the “petit enclose” in the Urban Basilica Cemetery and Northwest Chapel/Cemetery may actually be a plot of tombs, familial or not, inserted into an abandoned building in the fifth century.” See Joan Marguerite Downs, “The Christian Tomb Mosaics from Tabarka: Status and Identity in a North African Roman Town” (University of Michigan, 2007), 76. There is also, of course, the question of Phoenician child sacrifice, for which there is no consensus. See, e.g., Shelby Brown, Late Carthaginian Child Sacrifice (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).
If this is the case, then the archive room was not necessarily burned intentionally. Perhaps it was an accidental fire that occurred as a result of Squatter habitation or an event from outside the walls of the building. Such an accident occurred in Antioch during the life of the archive (i.e., not after abandonment – *War* 7.55).

**The Western Rooms (Rooms W1, W3, W4, W4a, W5, W6, and W7 – Figure 57)**

All of the western rooms (Rooms W1, W3, W4, W5, W6, and W7) are, like the northern rooms, almost totally devoid of material that is certainly Squatter.

In Room W1 a small section of plaster surface was found against the southern wall of the room at an elevation of 464.72 m. In addition, a nearly complete Hermon Jar was found against the same wall, though further east, the toe of which was at 464.97 m. No surface was found at this elevation, though it closely corresponds to the elevation of the burnt soil floor **CB37010** in Room W2, to the east. The northern and southern doorways were intentionally blocked at some point (see the section on Room N1 on the interpretation of northern door blockage), and at the bottom of the southern door block one large, flat paver was found with an upper elevation of 464.69 m., which might have been part of the original floor in this room. There was nothing diagnostic of Squatter presence in Room W1, even in Early Roman robbing loci.

---

372 Room W4 and Room W4a are two parts of one room (see below). They were initially given separate room numbers for greater precision in analyzing the material.

373 CB38023

374 I don’t have Peter’s pottery database, but from a perusal of the unit reading sheets from K00 CB 3.8, I find ESA (unknown amount) in units 001 (**CB38010** - topsoil), 002 (**CB38010** - topsoil), 005 (**CB38010** - topsoil – earliest ESA platter X 2 Hayes 2 & triangle rim cookpot), 007 (**CB38011** – fill under subsoil – inventoried – mold-made bowl in ESA fabric Hayes 29 – **CB38011** – not in this room), a fish plate sent to inventory in 118 (**CB38017** – fill/debris on floor **CB38018**), and a white Hell jar (Jerusalem?) in 010 (**CB38011**), as well as a “Rim store jar Jerusalem clay? Motza – to Akko” in 029 (**CB38013**). I don’t think that BCW was recognized (or, if it was, I don’t think that it was recorded) in 2000. Whatever the case, it probably got lumped into “cookware”, for there is no differentiation and no mention of BCW.
What is more curious than the lack of Squatter presence in the western rooms is that they appear to have blocked all of the doorways on a N/S axis. As noted above, (see the section on Room N1), sometime around the time of the building’s abandonment the archive room (Room N1) was set afire and the doorway to the south was blocked. The same can be said for the doorways between Rooms W1 and W3, between Rooms W3 and W4, and between Rooms W4a and Room W5. The door block between Rooms W4a and W5 (door block CB28005 in wall CB28004) consisted of ashlars and field stones two courses deep resting on packed soil fill. When the door block was removed, plaster floor CB28003 was found to run from Room W5 northward into the doorway (Figure 58). The LDM for both the door block and the 0.1 underneath it were Hermon Jar, Local Fine, and a Phoenician Semi-Fine square rim jar (i.e., the final-PHAB phase), but it is most likely that the blocking of this doorway occurred in a post-abandonment phase, given that the door block itself was soil, ashlar, and fieldstone, was not the same width as the wall into which it was being placed, and that it was not plastered over (the plaster originally on the south face of wall CB28004 ended at the door block). This last point is worth noting.

Other places in the building in which a door was blocked during the life of the building (for instance, the door block between the Stylobate Corridor and the northeastern corner of Room C2, in wall CB35021), exhibit well made blockages of cut stone that fit the doorway well and were plastered over (see Figure 36).

**Room W3**

Room W3 presents an interesting example of the Squatter material in the building. As noted above, the northern and southern doorways into Room W3 were blocked, likely by the Squatters. Within the room there is a floor (CB38031) at an elevation of 465.14 m.
The soil on top of this floor contained an ESA mold made bowl, a cast glass rim, and consistent LDMs of ESA and Early Roman cookware. Furthermore, the soil in the places where the floor was degraded and disturbed contained Early Roman LDMs in four of the seven units that comprise the locus, as well as another piece of the ESA mold made bowl that was discovered in the soil on top of the floor, a stamped amphora handle dating to 166-107 BCE, and a Roman cookware jar rim. There were also 3 large storage jars – 2 Galilean and 1 possible Judaean.

At first glance this looks much like the Squatter material profile found elsewhere in the building and would likely cause us to wonder if the metal, beads, loom weights, etc. that were also found in this room belonged to the Squatters. However, a closer look at the evidence shows that the Squatters did not use this room (even if they were the ones who blocked the doorways). Aside from the ESA mold-made bowl, the ESA and Early Roman cookware that comprise the LDMs in these two soil loci – which, it should be mentioned, consisted of 16,600 L of soil and 171.1 kg of pottery – amount to three small unidentifiable sherds of ESA weighing less than 0.03 kg, one tiny unidentifiable sherd of Roman cookware weighing less than 0.01 kg, a piece of an Early Roman cookware jar, a piece of a possible 1st century CE Phoenician Semi-Fine baggy jar, and a piece of a possible 1st century CE Early Roman jar rim. Furthermore, the soil on top of the floor (CB38030) contained 38 items that were considered important enough to be inventoried.

---

375 CB38030
376 K06P036. Note that it mends with sherds from CB38032.
377 K06G010
378 CB38032
379 K06SAH007. Joins with one of the SAHs in CB38030?
380 K06P096. Also found were a bronze fibula (K06T#781), a glass inset (K06T#782), a pierced bone appliqué (K06T#783), and a bone semicircular appliqué (K06T#784).
including three lamps, seven identifiable vessels, eight stamped amphora handles, and two coins that date to PHAB abandonment and pre-abandonment phases. The amount and type of finds discovered in CB38030 (and especially the whole or nearly whole vessels) suggest that it is a disturbed primary deposit from the abandonment of the PHAB. Indeed, it can only be interpreted as evidence of either Squatter reuse of PHAB vessels or Squatter non-use of this room. Given the incredibly small amount of unambiguously Squatter material found in Room W3, the fact that we have only one example of possible Squatter reuse of a PHAB vessel for its intended purpose, and the fact that whole vessels dating to the abandonment of the PHAB were found on the floor of this room, it seems most likely that this room was blocked off and unused during the Squatter phase of the building.

Rooms W4 and W4a

We find the same situation in Rooms W4 and W4a, which are two parts of the same room. In locus CB20828, a rubble and plaster fill with an LDM of BCW and

---

381 The lamps were: a glazed ware lamp body sherd (K06L014); a glazed ware delphiniform lamp body sherd (K06L015); and an Atticizing black glaze lamp (K06L018).

382 The vessels were: a Koan Knidian cup (K06P035); a Phoenician Semi-Fine amphoriskos (K06P037); a Semi-Fine juglet (K06P038); a hemispherical bowl in an unknown fabric (K06P039); a Semi-Fine amphoriskos (K06P040); a black glazed stemmed dish (K06P097); and a lagynos (K06P099).

383 K06SAH006 (150 BCE); K06SAH008 (147 BCE); K06SAH009 (166-146 BCE); K06SAH010 (166-146 BCE); K06SAH011 (154/153-146 BCE); K06SAH012 (154/153 BCE); K06SAH013 (154/153 BCE); K06SAH014 (144-118 BCE).

384 Both generic Seleucid 2nd century BCE coins (K06C012 and K06C024). A third, unintelligible coin was also found (K06C030). The other inventoried objects from this locus were: 2 carnelian beads (K06BD005 and K06BD006); a bone inlay button (K06BI017); a cast glass rim (K06GO10); 2 glass counters (K06GO11); 2 unfired loom weights (K06TC003 and K06TC006); 2 sickle blades, on fragmentary and the other intact (K06M010 and K06M021 [intact]); an iron knife (K06M023); a bronze knife (K06M025); a bronze fibula arch (K06M027); a bronze bracelet (K06M029); a nail (K06M031); a hand stone (K06S018); and a Canaanian blade (K06S027).

385 <the Spatter cookpot/jar>. They reused some of the PHAB vessels – for instance, Hermon jars for a tabun in the Stylobate Corridor – but not for the vessels’ intended purpose.

386 Only the 3 x 5 m. northern half of CB2.8 NE was excavated, so it is possible that a wall dividing Room W4 from Room W4a could be found in the southern half of that quadrant. However, if that were the case, it would require Room W4 to be between 2.33 and 2.85 m. wide (north/south) and Room W4a to be between
ESA, 24.98 kg of pottery was recovered from 4,610 L of soil. Among them were only 9 sherds of BCW and one sherd of an ESA hemispherical cup. Indeed, in the entirety of the soil excavated from Room W4 (15,680 L) there was 0.012 kg of BCW (plus 15 sherds) and 5 sherds of ESA mixed in with 0.1 kg of Roman pottery (plus 2 sherds). Though a coin of Antiochus VII\(^{387}\) was found in CB28010 (Hellenistic and Roman fill), the pottery and finds were all PHAB phase or earlier, with the exception of one sherd of Kfar Hananya pottery (out of 23 kg of pottery and 6,080 L of soil). If the Squatters used this room then they left far less than 1 vessel behind along with the coin of Antiochus VII. Though there is a bit of residual Squatter material, the overall artifact profile in this room matches that of rooms that were uninhabited by the Squatters. The Squatter coin and pottery here is most likely the result of complete robbing of the wall (CB28002/CB28016) that divided Room W4 room from the Western Corridor, which the Squatters used (see Figure 59).

**Room W5**

Room W5 is yet another room for which there no evidence of Squatter use, though, as mentioned above, it is likely that the Squatters blocked the doorway between Rooms W4a and W5 (CB28005). Plaster floor CB28003, which lies at an elevation of 465.14 m, runs under door block CB28005 and over the threshold of the doorway in wall CB28004. The fill above the floor (CB28008 from elevations 465.93 m. down to 465.34 m.) is characterized by a high density of large Hermon Jar sherds with good edges, and

---

1.4 and 2.29 m. wide (north/south). Though conceptually possible for a “broom closet”-like room to exist (the South-Central Corridor is ca. 1.88 m. wide and room Room S5 is ca. 2.14 m. wide), there are no external rooms smaller than Room N5 (which measures ca. 3.2 m. wide), and the Western Corridor measures 3.4 m. wide. Furthermore, when the loci from Room W4 are compared with those from Room W4a, the results are the same – the same soils, the same finds, and the same densities of pottery. 

\(^{387}\) K08C028 (134-133 BCE)
within this fill one Hermon Jar was found on its side, crushed, at an elevation of 465.52 m. It seems that there were a number of Hermon Jars being stored in Room W5 that were churned up during the wall robbing episode. The sum total of Squatter pottery found below subsoil in Room W5 was 3 tiny sherds of ESA.

Room W6
The room in the southwest corner of the building, Room W6, shows no evidence of Squatter occupation whatsoever. In fact, in all of the soil dug below subsoil, from 465.73 m. to 464.59 m. (9,910 L of soil), not one ESA or BCW sherd (and only one Kfar Hananya sherd, in the second-highest unit) was found in 86.98 kg of pottery. Within the room two floors were found, CB18004, at 464.96 m. (LDM underneath was an Iron Age cookpot) and CB18005, at 464.85 m. (LDM was an Iron Age cookpot).

Room W7
The same can be said for Room W7 (that has been said for Room W6): in 12,270 L. of soil and 369.95 kg of pottery there was nothing diagnostically Squatter found below subsoil with the possible exception of one small sherd of cast glass. Like Room W6, this room also had two floors, a white plaster floor, CB18010, at 465.09 m. (LDM: BSP rim, Chian lagynos sherd; LDM in the 0.1 was a local fine saucer and Hellenistic cookware), and a blue-grey plaster floor, CB18011, at 465.01.\(^{388}\)

\(^{388}\) Note that this piece of cast glass likely came from the robbing trench on the south side of the floor that was the result of robbing the south wall of the building down to its foundations.
The Squatter material profile of the rooms bounding the southern side of the Central Courtyard is very much like those of the Western and Northern Rooms.

**Room S3**

The northern part of the eastern wall was robbed deeply (down to 464.14 m.; it is preserved as high as 465.21 m.).\(^{390}\) The final PHAB phase of the room included a thick plaster floor with pottery sherds pressed into the matrix (CB17004), set on top of a cobble subfloor that looked very much like the subfloor of the Central Courtyard. This floor and the floor beneath it (CB17008) were cut by a deep post-12\(^{\text{th}}\) century CE grave that used the north wall of the room for a northern grave wall and into which was placed a southern wall of large stones (CB17018), and was capped with very large, flat stones (CB17002). The soil (CB17019) on top of the plaster-and-sherd floor (CB17004) contained a few ESA fish plate and saucer sherds, curiously only appearing in units dug in the southern half of the room (one would assume that these few sherds came from robbing disturbance). All of the other finds in CB17019 were from the PHAB phases: a coin of Antiochus III,\(^{391}\) an architectural fragment,\(^{392}\) and Phoenician Semi-Fine, Local Fine, BSP, and sandy cookware pottery.\(^{393}\) The only other known Squatter material evidence from the 23,070 L. of soil and 209.8 kg of pottery in this room are 6 sherds of

---

\(^{389}\) Room S3 is bounded by walls CB17001 (to the west), CB17003/CB27004 (to the north), CB17006 (to the east), and CB17007 (to the south).

\(^{390}\) The maximum preserved height of the other walls was 465.39 m. (CB17001); 465.39 m. (CB17003/CB27004); 465.21 m. (CB17006); and 464.38 m. (CB17007).

\(^{391}\) K06C009 (198-188 BCE)

\(^{392}\) K06S003

\(^{393}\) Ambiguous finds included astragali (K06BI012; K06T#654) and a possible sling ball (unk. K06T#).
ESA, a cast glass fragment, and a glass pyxis lid, all found in later contexts such as soil that was excavated from elevations above the southern wall of the room and which had a Byzantine LDM, or in soil disturbed by the Islamic burial in the northern part of the room.

Room S4

Room S4 is bounded by walls CB16034 (to the north, between Room S4 and the Central Courtyard), CB16030 (to the east), CB16029/CB16044/CB17005 (to the south), and CB17006 (to the west). Within the room is floor CB16032, on top of which were built two plaster bins, a rectangular one (CB16027) that is in the northwest corner of the room, and a square one (CB16026) in the northeast corner of the room. In the southeast corner of the room a semicircular installation (CB16028) was found attached to the eastern wall (CB16030). Floor CB16032 (surface elevation of 464.72 m. [high]/464.60 m. [low]) bonded with the western wall (CB17006), the eastern wall (CB16030), the southern wall (if that’s what CB16029 is – it’s called a “partition wall” on the CB16028 locus sheet), the two bins in the north (CB16026 and CB16027), and the semicircular installation (CB16028).

Almost nothing belonging to the Squatters was found in Room S4. In the soil (CB16040) that came down on floor CB16032, 0.031 kg of ESA was found (all in the

394 K06G007
395 K06G003
396 The glass pyxis lid (K06G003) was found in the foundation trench for the Islamic grave; a cast glass body sherd (K06G007) and a Brindisi amphora fragment (K06T#018), were found in CB1701, the Byzantine/Crusader activity above the southern wall of the room. Cast glass body sherd K06G012 was recovered from the pottery in the plaster and sherd floor and is presumed to be an intrusion.
397 CB16040 is a 25-30 cm.-thick soil deposit underneath subsoil and on top of plaster floors CB16031 (Room S5), CB16032 (Room S4), and CB16024 (Central Court yard) and their equivalent elevations throughout CB 1.6 NE and NW (e.g., ashlar blocks that are part of wall CB16030). The units from CB16040 and the rooms in which they were dug are as follows: CB1.6.081 (Room S4); CB1.6.083 (Room S4 and Room S5); CB1.6.087 (Room S4?); CB1.6.092 (Room S4); CB1.6.093 (Room S5 and the South-
upper elevations, immediately below subsoil). No other ESA was found in Room S4, and no BCW was found anywhere in the room. In addition, the pottery that was excavated from units immediately on top of floor **CB16032**, some of which were almost complete or mendable vessels, belonged to the PHAB. In like fashion, no evidence of the Squatters was found in the bins or the semi-circular installation.

**The Rooms South of the South-Central Corridor (Rooms S5, S6, S7, S9, and S11 – Figure 61)**

The evidence within Room S5 looks very much like that of Room S4. Room S5 is bounded by **CB16034** to the north, **CB16046** (to the east), **CB16033** (to the south) and **CB16030** (to the west). Within the room there is a floor, **CB16031** (surface elevation 464.69 m. [high]/464.62 m. [low]), and a quarter-circle installation (**CB16025**). It is impossible to determine what belongs only to this room, as the soil above the floor (**CB16040**) was dug across wall lines. However, the units from **CB16040** that were dug in Room S5 but not in Room S4 do not add any Squatter evidence to the equation.

---

398 The ESA comes from units CB1.6.081 and CB1.6.083, and both are underneath subsoil units. The subsoil of this trench (CB16037) had 0.055 kg of ESA in it.

399 Objects included 58 sherds of a cookpot in _____ fabric that preserve the rim to the base (K06P046), a Phoenician semi-fine unguentarium (K06P047), a BSP hemispherical bowl (K06P018), N.B., fragments found in CB16040 mend with fragments found in CB16037 [subsoil]), a grooved-rim pot in Gritty Cookware (K06P046); a delphiniform lamp (K06L009 – note that fragments of 4 other lamps were also found). Other “ambiguous” objects included a spatter jar rim that joins with a piece inventoried in 2000 (K06T#1079); 2 coins (K06C017 and K06C019 – entries for both are missing in the IAA conspectus so the readings are unknown); an iron buckle (K06M018); half of an iron tool or weapon (K06M019); an iron knife (K06M020); a nail (K06M034); a coreform glass bottle (K06T#402); two lead tokens (K06C016 and K06C019), and 5 flat iron fragments (K06T#548).

400 The units from CB16040 that belong in this room include CB1.6.083 (dug in Room S4 and Room S5), CB1.6.093 (Room S5 and the South-Central Corridor), CB1.6.095 (Room S4 and Room S5), and CB1.6.122 (Room S5 and the top of wall CB16034).
Furthermore, CB16056, the floor deposit in the eastern half of the room (which is essentially equivalent to CB16040), had no Squatter material at all in 340 L of soil and 6.1 kg of pottery. Though these are relatively small amounts of soil and pottery, it should be noted that that small amount produced five inventoried ceramic vessels,\(^{401}\) a coin of Antiochus V,\(^{402}\) and a coin of Demetrius II’s first reign,\(^{403}\) all of which belong to the final PHAB phase of the building. In sum, the only evidence of Squatter presence is an ESA or BSP moldmade bowl\(^{404}\) from the units of CB16040 that were dug between Room S5 and the South-Central Corridor, as well as 0.03 kg of ESA that was dug immediately under subsoil in a unit spanning Rooms S4 and S5.\(^{405}\)

**Rooms S6, S7, S9, and S11**

Any understanding of the area just southwest of the intersection of the Stylobate Corridor and the Southeastern Corridor is complicated by major remodeling projects during the life of the PHAB, as well as extensive wall robbing after the Squatters left. At some point during the life of the PHAB, the courtyard drain (CB16009/CA96003) was rerouted from its original position running north/south through the eastern portion of Room S8 to the southeastern corner of the Central Courtyard by way of Rooms S9, S6, and the South-Central Corridor.\(^{406}\) As a result of the rerouting of the drain, either a

\(^{401}\) A Spatter bowl profile (K08P041); 9 fragments of a large bowl (“measure” – K08P042); a Phoenician Semi-Fine unguentarium (K08P053); a Spatter bowl (K08P054); and a Spatter rim and neck (K08P044).  
\(^{402}\) K08C010 (163-162 BCE)  
\(^{403}\) K06C017 (144-143 BCE), from unit CB1.6.093  
\(^{404}\) K06P025, from unit CB1.6.093.  
\(^{405}\) That unit, noted above in the discussion of Room S4, is CB1.6.083. It was noted there that the subsoil locus ([CB16037]) had 0.055 kg of ESA in it.  
\(^{406}\) This may perhaps be the result of Room S2, Room S3, and Room S4 being built in what used to be the Central Courtyard. That is, it is possible that CB16009/CA96003 was a drain for the Central Courtyard throughout the life of the building and that the rerouting of the drain is evidence of the southern wall of the Central Courtyard having moved north (i.e., that it originally extended all the way to wall CB17005/CB16044 [i.e., to what is now the southern wall of rooms Room S2, Room S3, and Room S4]).
breach was made in the west wall of Room S9 (CB16046), in the south wall of Room S6 (CB16051), and in the north wall of Room S6 (CB16047) or the drain was rerouted through the doorways of these rooms. ⁴⁰⁷

The intersection of walls CB15018, CB16049, CB16051, and CB16049 (i.e., where these four rooms come together) was robbed completely, as was the intersection of walls CB16049, CB16047, and CB15023 (between Rooms S6, S7, and the South-Central Corridor). In addition, wall CB15018 was found partially covered by floor CB15019, suggesting that in the Squatter phase of the building Rooms S7 and S11 constituted one room (or, perhaps, entryway, if there was a southern entrance to the building here.) The designation of Rooms S6, S7, S11, and S9 as separate rooms for the purposes of describing their contents is a bit problematic because of the degree to which the walls were robbed (and thus the consequent inability to say that soil excavated from a given room did not come from another room).

Room S6 is bounded by walls CB16047 (the northern wall), CB16049 (the eastern wall, of which only a small stublet remained), CB16051 (the southern wall) and CB16046 (the western wall). No floor was found in this room.

Room S7, immediately east of Room S6, is bounded by CB15023 to the north, CB15017 to the east, K09 CB15018⁴⁰⁸ to the south, and the stublet of CB15049 to the west. The floor within Room S7 is floor CB16050/CB15019, with a surface elevation of 464.40/464.38 m.

⁴⁰⁷ See Ameera Elrasheedy and Henry Colburn’s final report for the 2008 excavation of CB1.6 and CA9.6. ⁴⁰⁸ CB15018 was mistakenly assigned twice, and as a result it is here designated “K09 locus CB15018” and “K06 locus CB15018.” K09 locus CB15018 is the south wall of Room S7. K06 locus CB15018 is the main N/S wall of CB 1.5 SE, running from the southern edge of CB15002 to the southern edge of the trench.
Room S11 is bounded by CB15018 to the north, CB15017/CA95021 to the east, CA96002/CA95010 to the south, and CA96030/CB16049 to the west. Floor CB15019 continued over the top of part of CB15018 and is the floor in Room S11, at an elevation of 464.38.

Room S9, west of the northern portion of Room S11 and immediately south of Room S6, is bounded by CB16051 to the north, CB16049 to the east, CB16048 to the south, and had no extant western wall. No floor was found in this room.

There is no evidence for Squatter presence in any of these rooms. Though the subsoil \([\text{CB16002}]\) in the 10 m. x 5 m. area of CB1.6 NW and NE included 0.2 kg (plus 23 sherds) of ESA, nothing later than BSP was found below subsoil (and no BCW was found in CB1.6). Furthermore, the units from \([\text{CB16002}]\) in which ESA was found were at high elevations and in the very north of Room S7, above or just south of wall CB16047 (in fact, all three of these units were attempting to find or define wall CB16034).\(^{409}\) This is important because there is ample evidence for Squatter presence in South-Central Corridor, and it is possible that the ESA that was found in units technically south of the southern face of wall CB16034 were from the South-Central Corridor. “Possible” becomes almost certain when we look at the rest of the loci from Rooms S6, S7, and S9. Only 6 sherds of ESA were found in these three rooms: one in the Hellenistic phase of Room S6 \([\text{CB16058}]\), which is immediately below \([\text{CB16002}]\)\(^{410}\) and five in \([\text{CB15027}]\), the

---

\(^{409}\) CB1.6.166 (465.28 m. down to 464.85 m. – 0.1 kg of ESA); CB1.6.170 (464.93 m. down to 464.70 m. – 4 sherds of ESA); CB1.6.171 (464.96 m. down to 464.28 m. – 6 sherds of ESA).

\(^{410}\) The sherd of ESA is from CB1.6.187; a cast glass bowl rim, K08G003, was also found in CB1.6.189. Other finds in this locus included two generic 2nd century BCE coins (K08C029 – dated to 163-126 BCE \([??!!]\) and K08C031 – dated to 159-129\([??!!]\)) and a coin of Demetrius I (159-158 BCE – K08C030), a BSP lamp (K08L007), a delphiniform lamp (K08L014), a Phoenician Semi-Fine flanged rim juglet base (K08P047), a Phoenician Semi-Fine juglet (K08P055), an Attic base fragment (K08P059), a sandy cookpan rim (K08P087), and a Pergamene hemispherical bowl (K08P255). In other words, the ESA and cast glass do not fit with the chronologically homogenous set of finds in this locus.
robbertime trench over **K09 locus CB15017** (which is to say, in the area where the wall between Room S7 and the intersection of the Stylobate Corridor and the Southeastern Corridor is missing. Again, there is ample evidence for Squatter presence in the Stylobate Corridor and the Southeastern Corridor.) Only 1 sherd of BCW was found in these three rooms, and that was in **CB15026** (the robber’s trench over wall **CB15023**, which separated Rooms S6 and S7 from the known Squatter-used area of South-Central Corridor).

Equally as interesting as the fact that the tiny amount of Squatter material that was found in the 45.79 m² that make up these three rooms was found in the very northern reaches of them is the profile of the Early Roman loci associated with the wall robbing episodes. **CB16060**, the soil in the robbing trench over the intersection of walls **CB15051** and **CB16049** (that is, in the center of the area consisting of these three rooms) has an LDM of Kfar Hananya and a Kfar Hananya cooking bowl but no BCW and no ESA. So also with **CB15024**, the soil between patches of floor **CB15019** in CB1.5 SW and NW: an Early Roman LDM with no BCW and no ESA. Neither was there Squatter material found in **CB15028**, the deposit on top of floor **CB15019**, **CB16054**, the Hellenistic fill in the southeast corner of CB1.6SE, or **CB16059**, the Hellenistic phase of Room S9. In short, the Squatter material is entirely located against, over, or in association with the robbing of **CB16047** and the northern portion of **CB15017**, on the other side of which were Squatter-used areas, and the Early Roman loci and the soil loci on top of the

---

411 **CB15017** was mistakenly assigned twice, and as a result it is here designated “**K09 locus CB15017**” and “**K06 locus CB15017**.” **K09 locus CB15017** is the east wall of Room S7 and Room S11. **K06 locus CB15017** is “the fill below a very large stone in the SE quadrant of CB 1.5.” (That is the locus description on the locus sheet. The locus/loci that were over **K06 locus CB15017** are not listed.

412 **K08P256**
floors south of CB16047 contain no Squatter material – in marked contrast to such soil in Squatter-used areas of the building.

It is worth noting, though, that CB16002 includes 25 units and extends from 465.08 m. down to 464.15 m. (the top of the highest extant wall was at 464.88 m. [CB16047] and the top of the lowest extant wall was 464.52 [CB16051]). While it is true that these units and elevations cover two quadrants (CB1.6 NE and CB1.6 SE) and rubble appears to be the defining characteristic that caused these units to be lumped together, this locus extended only from 464.85 down to 464.62 m. when it was dug in CB1.6 SW in 2000. The subsoil in CB1.6 NW was locused as CB16037 when it was dug in 2006 and extended from 465.15 (high)/465.00 (low) down to 465.10 (high)/464.66 (low). Even if we assume that the twenty-five units in CB16002 ought to be locused together based on the presence of between 35% and 95% rubble (of widely varying sizes), we must ask whether or not the presence of Squatter material in this locus indicates that Squatters used these rooms (and the rubble is wall collapse or the result of wall robbing) or is the result of later plowing and activity (in which case it was dragged or thrown from other rooms into these).

**The Southern Rooms (Rooms S8 and S10 – Figure 62)**

Room S10 is one of the most interesting rooms in the PHAB because of a fantastic primary deposit that was found on the floor and underneath a destruction layer. Within the room two floor patches were found in the southeast part of the room,

---

413 Unit CB1.6.159 (the last unit dug in 2006, and underneath locus CB16031), which has beginning and ending elevations of 463.90 and 463.76, respectively, was locused as CB16037. Assuming that this unit should not have been locused as such, the lowest ending elevation in locus CB16037 is 464.66 m. (in unit CB1.6.105).

414 Room S10 is bounded by CB16048 (to the north), CA96029/CB16049 (to the east), CA96002 (to the south), and CB16005 (to the west).
CA96031, a thick plaster floor, and CA96032, a low-quality plaster floor that bonded with the doorway threshold (CA96030) in the eastern wall (in the southeast part of the room). CA96031 had a surface elevation of 464.09 m. and CA96032 had a surface elevation of 463.99 m.

Within the room a primary deposit and destruction layer was uncovered. It spanned the entire room, covering both floor patches, and consisted of a ca. 65 cm.-thick ash layer containing very burnt pottery (including and a stamped amphora handle dating to between 154/3 and 146 BCE) and multiple in situ vessels. The pottery found in this destruction layer and the date of the stamped Rhodian amphora handle correspond perfectly with the abandonment of the PHAB. The destruction of Room S10 and the abandonment of the PHAB were coterminous. This means that Room S10 provides a wonderful test case for Squatter presence – the room was burned before or

---

415 CA96033

According to the locus sheets, the primary deposit and destruction layer was only found on top of floor patch CA96031. Floor patch CA96032, the slightly lower, poorer quality floor that was found bonded to threshold CA96030, is explicitly described as having been covered by CA96021, a soil locus that includes three units (CA9.6.124, CA9.6.125, and CA9.6.127) and is described as “an exposed/slightly contaminated top of the primary deposit [that] yielded many large and mendable sherds of SF spatter and amphora” and covered primary deposit CA96033, threshold CA96030, and floor CA96032. However, both primary deposit CA96033 and soil locus CA96034 (the soil “directly beneath” primary deposit CA96033) are specifically described as being bordered by all four walls and threshold CA96030 (though CA96034 was below the level of threshold CA96030). Given that floor CA96032 bonded with threshold CA96030, it seems possible (probable?) that primary deposit CA96033 was on top of both floor patches.

416 K08SAH008

Included were one fragment of a clear cast glass grooved bowl rim (K08G013/K08T#1570), a baggy jar toe (K08P181), three Phoenician Semi-Fine table amphoras (K08P182, K08P189, and K08P273), a Phoenician semi-fine angled-rim table amphora (K08P272), a Phoenician Semi-Fine juglet (K08P198), a Phoenician Semi-Fine flanged-rim juglet (K08P274), a Phoenician Semi-Fine flanged-rim juglet foot (K08P275), a sandy grooved-rim jug (K08P271), a BSP fish plate (K08P258), a Koan/Knidian cup in an unknown fabric (K08P259), a CNF or BSP incurved-rim bowl with a rouletted floor (K08P260), a spatter everted-rim bowl (K08P262), a spatter incurved-rim bowl (K08P263), a sandy necked pointed-rim cookpot (K08P267), a necked plain-rim cookpot in an unknown fabric (K08P268), a sandy flanged, angled-rim casserole (K08P269), a footed basalt mortar (K08S028), three handstones (K08S031, K08S032, K08S037), a sandstone grinder/pecker (K08S037), and a stamped amphora handle dating to between 154/3 and 146 BCE (K08SAH008).
during the building’s abandonment and the destruction layer was left undisturbed until 2008.

There is no BCW and only 5 small sherds of ESA in the entire room: two in the contaminated subsoil\textsuperscript{419} and three in the primary deposit/destruction layer.\textsuperscript{420} Of these three one is from CA9.6.131, which was immediately under CA9.6.127 (described as “topsoil” in the unit description, and removed separate from the rest of the primary deposit because the excavators feared contamination). It seems likely that this sherd was left over from CA9.7.127 (which had a Roman LDM). The other two were in CA9.6.136, a unit which was under CA9.6.131 (just described), CA9.6.133 (removal of the primary floor deposit), CA9.6.134 (removal of the primary floor deposit), and CA9.6.135 (jar removal). Though that information makes these two sherds of ESA are very difficult to explain stratigraphically, the fact that they are two sherds weighing less than 0.01 kg and the remaining 12.1 kg of pottery had nothing later than BSP (ca. 160 BCE), and the fact that there were 5 total sherds of ESA (ca. 0.015 kg) out of 610.8 kg (\textit{sic!}) of pottery that included 17 whole or nearly whole vessels requires us to interpret these two sherds as contamination. The Squatters did not use Room S10.

\textbf{Room S8}\textsuperscript{421}

The eastern, central, and western parts of Room S8 are one room that have been divided into west, central, and eastern thirds for greater precision in analyzing the material. This is a very large room (74.25 m\textsuperscript{2}), within which an extension of the drain

\textsuperscript{419} Unit CA9.6.124.
\textsuperscript{420} 1 sherd in CA9.6.131 and 3 sherds in CA9.6.136.
\textsuperscript{421} Room S8 is bounded by CB17026 on the west (the wall that forms the western wall of the Central Courtyard further to the north), CB17005/CB16044, CB16001, and CB16033 on the north, CA96005/CB16005 on the east, and CA96002/CB17025 on the south.
was constructed,\textsuperscript{422} running from the south wall of Room S2 to an intersection with drain \textit{CB16009} in the eastern quarter of the room. (A small section of plaster over the top of wall \textit{CB17005} immediately north of the drain basin at the extreme west end of the drain makes it clear that there was access to it from Room S2). A multitude of floor patches,\textsuperscript{423} and five tabuns were discovered: one (\textit{CB17030}) spanning the artificial boundary between the eastern and central thirds of Room S8, in the northeastern corner of CB1.7 SW, with a bottom elevation of 464.80 m. (K08 elevation)/464.73 m. (K09 elevation); a second (\textit{CB17031}) in the southeastern corner of CB1.7 SW, with a bottom elevation of 464.83 m.; a third (\textit{CB17032}) in the southwest corner of CB1.7 SW, with a bottom

\textsuperscript{422} \textit{CB17042/CB16010}: The western third of Room S8: \textit{CB17028}, at 464.99 m. and, 26 cm. deeper, \textit{CB17070}, at 464.73 m. \textit{CB17029} was found at 464.70 m. [K09 locus sheet] or, perhaps, 464.54 m. (K08 locus sheet). See the next paragraph (in this footnote) on this discrepancy and the reason that 464.70 m. is more likely. The central 1/3 of Room S8: \textit{CB17041}, at 464.97/464.92 m; \textit{CB17047}, at 464.89 m; \textit{CB17044}, at 464.84 m; \textit{CB17048}, at 464.82 m; \textit{CB17045}, at 464.79 m. (K08 elevation)/464.71 m. (low); and \textit{CB17046}, at 464.67 m. (high)/464.59 (low) m. The eastern third of Room S8: \textit{CB16003}, at 464.69 m; \textit{CA96011}, (between walls \textit{CA96002}, \textit{CA96007}, and \textit{CA96008}), at 464.65 m; \textit{CB16018}, at 464.63 m, which had a sub-plaster floor \textit{CB16019}, at 464.53 m; \textit{CA96015}, at 464.62 m; \textit{CB16016}, at 464.62 m; \textit{CA96010}, at 464.55 m; \textit{CA96016}, at 464.48; and \textit{CA96012}, at 464.47 m.

There is a possible discrepancy in the floor elevations for floor \textit{CB17029}. They are 464.54 m. in K08 (CB1.7 SW) and 464.70 m. in K09 (CB1.7 SE). This sort of variation in the floors is possible, but the K08 locus sheets are very confusing about which tabuns were on this floor. The locus sheet for the floor (\textit{CB17029}) in K08 says that “the level of this floor lies below that of the NE and SE tabuns (\textit{CB17030} and \textit{CB17031}), but at the level of the SW tabun (\textit{CB17032}).” The trench photos make it clear that the NE and SE tabuns were roughly at the same level, while the SW tabun was founded much more deeply. (These tabuns are the ones that were destroyed by vandalism in 2008. There was not much more to do than clean up the detritus of the NE and SE tabuns, but the SW tabun was excavated to a much deeper level afterwards.) However, the \textit{CB17030/CB17030.0/CB17030.1} locus sheet says that the tabun is “roughly at the level of \textit{CB17029}” (the bottom of this tabun is at 464.66 m. or 464.70 m.), but that the 0.1 “extends downward to floor \textit{CB17029}” (note that the elevations for the 0.1 are 464.80 m. down to 464.66 m.). \textit{This would presumably put the floor elevation at 464.66 m}. The K09 locus sheet for \textit{CB17031.0} agrees with this assessment, stating that that there is 3 cm. of soil between the tabun and floor \textit{CB17029} (K09 \textit{CB17030.1} extends from 464.73 m. down to 464.70 m.), \textit{which would presumably put the floor elevation at 464.70 m}. The locus sheet for \textit{CB17031/CB17031.0/CB17031.1} says that the tabun is “roughly level with floor \textit{CB17029}” (the exact same words that are on the \textit{CB17030} locus sheet – the bottom of this tabun reportedly lies at 464.83 m.), but the 0.1 “extends downward to floor \textit{CB17029}” (elevations for the 0.1 are 464.83 m. down to 464.58 m.). \textit{This would presumably put the floor elevation at 464.58 m}. The locus sheets for \textit{CB17032/CB17032.0/CB17032.1} say that the tabun is “Roughly at the level of the floor \textit{CB17029}” (again the exact same words as on the other two locus sheets – bottom of this tabun lies at 464.56 m.). The 0.1 does not mention floor \textit{CB17029} (its elevations are 464.54 m. down to 464.14 m.). It is important to note here that the trench photos seem to clearly show the bottom of this tabun well below floor \textit{CB17029}. It seems most likely, then, that the K09 elevations (464.70 m., or thereabouts) are the correct elevations for floor \textit{CB17029}. 
elevation of 464.54 m.; and a fourth (CB17038) in the northern portion of CB1.7 SW with a bottom elevation of 464.80 m.; and a fifth (CB17039) near the center of CB1.7 SE with a bottom elevation of 464.88.

One tabun in particular is reminiscent of Squatter presence, CB17038 (though perhaps also tabun CB17039), in the central 1/3 of Room S8. CB17038 was well preserved, 0.8 m. in diameter, with a founding elevation of 464.80 m. (on floor CB17044). It stood against wall CB17005 and just north of platform CB17041, which had a surface elevation of 464.97 m. (high)/464.92 m. (low) (see Figure 64). CB17039 was much smaller (ca. 0.30 m. in diameter) and heavily damaged by rubble, perhaps from the robbing of nearby walls (see Figure 65). It had a founding elevation of 464.88 m., appropriate for an assumption that it sat on floor CB17044, though the heavy damage to the tabun made it impossible to fully articulate the relationship between the tabun and the floor. The LDM for tabun CB17038 included fragments of a Phoenician Semi-Fine flanged rim juglet, Akko Sandy Cooking Ware, and fragments of a Spatter Ware jug. The base of a Spatter Ware cookpot\textsuperscript{424} was also found in the soil inside of it.

Floor CB17044, which ran under one or both tabuns and platform CB17041, was a packed soil and limestone chip floor. It was located on the north side of wall CB17043 and abutted it. The LDM of floor CB17044 was BSP, CFN, and fragments of an overhanging rim krater.\textsuperscript{425} The LDM in CB17044.1 was Local Fine.

\textsuperscript{424} K09P036
\textsuperscript{425} The total weight of CB17044’s pottery was 1.4 kg (in 140 L of soil); the total weight of CB17044.1’s pottery was 0.04 kg (in 20 L of soil). Overhanging rim kraters are known in Greece from the early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE, and they occur in contexts dating broadly to the first three quarters of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE at Dor. One is known at Akko from a mid- to late-2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE context and five of twenty-one examples at Kedesh come from Hell 2 loci. (Personal communication with Peter Stone, May 24, 2011.)
Wall CB17043 was a small section of wall one course high and two courses wide (0.50-0.57 m. wide x 1.20-1.35 m. long x 0.095-0.265 m. high). Underneath it was 6-9 cm. of soil and then floor CB17045 (at 464.75 [high]/464.71 [low] m.). It divides between floor CB17047,\(^{426}\) to the south, and CB17044 and platform CB17041, to the north.\(^{427}\)

There is no floor deposit in this room. However, soil locus CB17054 overlies all of these features except the tabuns.\(^{428}\) It extended from 465.04 m. down to 464.52 m. and had an LDM of Kfar Hananya and Roman jar. It had no ESA or BCW,\(^{429}\) though it did have 0.77 kg (plus 5 sherds) of Sandy Cooking Ware, a cooking fabric for which there is currently no good evidence that the Squatters used. It also had the following PHAB-phase items that fit well with what we know of tabun use: a Sandy Cooking Ware lid rim,\(^{430}\) a Sandy Cooking Ware casserole rim,\(^{431}\) a Sandy cookpot rim and handle,\(^{432}\) and a Phoenician Semi Fine lid.\(^{433}\)

There are two other soil loci above these floors. CB17053, the Early Modern soil locus that spanned the entire trench and ran over the top of CB17054 and tabun CB17030 had one sherd of ESA and no BCW. CB17056, the fill in the robbing trench for wall

\(^{426}\) A 1.15 x 0.5 m. patch of plaster floor on the south side of wall stublet CB17043. It abuts (and therefore likely post-dates) CB17043. Its LDM was Sandy Cooking Ware, Spatter, and Local Fine. The LDM of CB17047.1 was an overhanging Rim Krater.

\(^{427}\) The one other floor patch, in the northeast corner of CB1.7 SE, is floor CB17048, a tiny patch at 464.82 m. that was likely originally part of CB17045. The LDM in CB17048 was fragments of a Sandy Cooking Ware casserole. The LDM of CB17048.1 was Local Fine, Spatter, and Sandy Cooking Ware.

\(^{428}\) With the possible exception of wall CB17043. The locus sheet for wall CB17043 says that it is under CB17054. The locus sheet for CB17054 does not mention wall CB17043. The locus sheet for CB17053, however, says that it is over wall CB17043. Tabun CB17030 is (also?) under CB17053.

\(^{429}\) It is interesting for the question of how the Parthian Green Glazed pottery should be phased to note that had 2 sherds in it (in units CB1.7.152 and CB1.7.153).

\(^{430}\) K09P014
\(^{431}\) K09P015
\(^{432}\) K09P016
\(^{433}\) K09P019. This locus also had other PHAB-phase items: a Western Asia Minor plate base (K09P017), a fish plate (K09P018), a BSP plate (K09P009), and a Hellenistic Glack Glazed bowl rim (K09P013).
CB17036 (in the extreme southeast corner of CB1.7 SW), and CB17055, a locus of units that overlay CB17056, had Judaean juglet, Roman Jar, and ESA for LDMs. However, the ESA LDM (in CB17055) consisted of three sherds of ESA. There was no other ESA and no BCW among the 91.15 kg of pottery that came out of these two loci. As in CB17054, there is a good deal of PHAB-phased cooking ware that was probably associated with the use of these tabuns: a Sandy cookpot base and a Sandy Cooking Ware casserole in CB17055 and a Sandy Courseware pan, and a Sandy cookpot in CB17056.

When we step back even further and look at all of the soil that was excavated from Room S8, there was a grand total of 1 sherd of BCW and 8 sherds of ESA were recovered from more than 36,954 L of soil and 513.74 kg of pottery. In comparison,
that same soil (some of which was admittedly under the floors, in PHAB-only phases) produced more than 11.49 kg (plus 101 sherds) of Sandy Cooking Ware.\footnote{N.B. that Hellenistic cooking wares are thin walled and therefore much lighter than thick walled vessels. 11.49 kg of cooking ware is an impressive amount.}

It seems clear, then, that the Squatters did not use this large southern room – or, if they did, then they left almost nothing behind. Conversely, the PHAB-phase users of this room left a large amount behind that is associated with tabun use.

The Rooms South of the Southeastern Corridor (Rooms S12, S13, and S14 – Figure 63)\footnote{Room S12 is bounded by CB15002 to the north, which has been robbed down to the Persian portion of the wall (CB15035 – upper elevation of 463.93 m.), by K09 CB15017 to the west, by CA95003 to the south. No Hellenistic wall was found to the east. Perhaps there was once a Hellenistic wall was on top of the Persian wall (K06 CB15018). Room S13 is bounded by the just-discussed CA95003 to the north, the just-discussed K06 CB15018 to the east, CA95010 (the Persian phase southern wall of the building, robbed down to 463.27 m. – no Hellenistic-phase wall was found here) to the south, and the just-discussed CA95021/K09 CB15017 to the west. Room S14 is bounded by CA95006, (the PHAB-phase southern wall of the building, robbed down to 463.58 m. [high]/463.46 m. [low]) on the south and the just-discussed K06 CB15018 to the west. CA95001/CB15003 is a Persian period wall and here too no Hellenistic wall was found. Either a wall was built on top of CA95001/CB15003 in the Hellenistic period, in which case Room S14 would appear to be a southern entryway and corridor, or the Hellenistic period wall is further east. CB15017 was assigned twice. In 2006 it was assigned to a soil locus “which was recovered from below a very large stone in the South Eastern quadrant of CB 1.5.” In 2009 it was assigned to the western wall of Room S12. As noted elsewhere, locus number CB15018 was assigned twice – first here, in 2006, and again, to another wall, in 2008. The K08 CB15018 is the east/west wall that divides between Room S7 and Room S11.}

Within Room S12 There is a cobble surface (CB15004) in the middle of the room at 463.97 m.; other than this no surface was found. K06 CB15018 and CA95003 were also robbed very deeply, K06 CB15018 to 463.27 m. and CA95003 to 463.94 m. Of the four walls, only K09 CB15017, with an upper elevation of 464.61 m. (high)/464.36 m. (low) is preserved to an elevation above surface CB15004. Given the situation presented by the widespread deep robbing of these walls and a consequent impossibility of understanding the pre-wall robbing stratification of soil and finds, the discussion of these
three rooms as though they are separate is nothing more than an artificial academic construct. Indeed

However, as far as an understanding of the Squatters goes, it does not matter. Within all of the soil in these three rooms there were eleven sherds of ESA found and no BCW. If the Squatters were using these rooms, the evidence of them has been so disrupted that it is impossible to find any meaningful trace. Given the evidence for them just to the north of this area and the depth of wall robbing, it is just as likely that the small amount of Squatter material came from the Southeastern Corridor and the Stylobate Corridor.
Chapter 5
The Squatters as the Dispossessed Urban Poor of Kedesh

It seems probable that there is some connection between the abandonment of the PHAB and 1 Maccabees’ account of the battle between Jonathan and Demetrius. Given how closely the Squatter phase follows the abandonment, it also seems likely that the battle contributed to the Squatter rehabilitation of the building. The search outside of Kedesh for a satisfactory explanation for the Squatters’ origin, presence, and material culture has not provided convincing possibilities. We have no reason to think that the entire population of the city of Kedesh was killed, enslaved, or run off by Jonathan – the people living in the city of Kedesh prior to Jonathan’s arrival continued to live there after Demetrius’ defeat. There is no good reason to think that Jonathan settled Judaeans at Kedesh, nor that he annexed any part of the Galilee to Judaea. And there is not enough evidence to ground a conclusion that the presence of a different material culture, by itself, an indication of the presence of a different people group.

Let us briefly recap the evidence. (1) The Squatter assemblage is a domestic assemblage. The presence of tabuns could, perhaps, just as well have been associated with seasonal workers, shepherds, or soldiers, but the fine table wares (including glass vessels) and the likelihood that the pyramidal loom weights, the copper alloy spatulae, and some of the fibulae belonged to the Squatters suggests not only domestic use, but also the presence of women. Furthermore, the proportions of utility, cooking, table, and toilet vessels in the overall assemblage are almost exactly the same as those at Tel Anafa.
(a villa) but are very different from those in the PHAB (an administrative building). Of the 142 coins excavated from the building, which span approximately 250 years, 56 (37%) were minted in the 24-28 years between 140/138 and 114/112 BCE. Furthermore, 52 of the 56 Squatter coins date to the first 15 years of Squatter occupation, while only 12 date to the final 15 years of PHAB occupation. (3) Of the 101 reconstructable vessels that are associated with the final, pre-abandonment phase of the PHAB there are no vessels in ESA, Basaltic Cooking Ware (BCW) or Tan Gray Marl (TGM). The Basaltic Cooking Ware was produced in the Golan Heights or the Chorazin Plateau, ca. 20 km southeast of Kedesh, and the inclusion of calcite as a temper, as well as its high-necked forms, is only known in potting traditions from Lower Galilee or the Central Hill region in this period. BCW was not found at Tel Anafa or Dan, ca. 12 and 16 km. to the northeast, respectively, and inhabited at the same time that the Squatters were living in the administrative building. The “southern style” cooking pots with high splayed necks, are also unknown at Tel Anafa. Three to five years before the Squatters were using BCW, the inhabitants of that very same building were using sandy and gritty cooking ware, which was produced on the coast, ca. 45 km to the west. What is more, the inhabitants of the LHSB at Tel Anafa (to the east of Kedesh) were using sandy cooking ware (coming from an area west of Kedesh) while the Squatters were using BCW (coming from an area southeast of Tel Anafa). Furthermore, both the inhabitants of the PHAB (before the Squatters) and the inhabitants of the LHSB at Tel Anafa (at the same time as the Squatters) used Spatter Painted Ware for cooking and table vessels, but the Squatters did not use Spatter at all. Rather, the Squatters used cooking vessels made of BCW and table vessels made of Tan Gray Marl instead of Spatter Painted Ware. Both types of pottery
were probably locally produced. On the other hand, the inhabitants of the PHAB, the
LHSB, and the Squatters all used Phoenician Semi-Fine; the inhabitants of the LHSB
and the Squatters both used ESA, while the inhabitants of the PHAB used BSP, which
came from the same clay source as ESA. (4) The Squatters had cast glass drinking
vessels, but in far fewer numbers than at Tel Anafa (34, as opposed to 116).

The phenomenon of rehabilitation and reuse of buildings after their abandonment,
especially well built, monumental buildings, is almost entirely unreported in the extant
literary sources from the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The only two that I have been
able to find are in m. Baba Bathra 3.1 and Xenophon’s *Anabasis*. M. Baba Bathra 3.1
reads,

> Title by *khazaqah* [i.e., claim to rightful ownership without title through
> proof of sustained possession for 3 years] to houses, cisterns, trenches,
> vaults, dovecots, bath houses, olive presses, irrigated fields, and slaves,
> and anything that brings constant gain, is secured by occupation during
> three completed years; title by *khazaqah* to unirrigated fields [is secured
> by occupation during] three years and they need not be completed.¹

It is unclear whether the Rabbis had in mind squatting of the sort that we find at Tel
Kedesh, for all sorts of structures are included and abandoned municipal buildings are
not. Even if they did, there is no suggestion that the behavior extended to Phoenician
cities.

The second example comes from Xenophon’s description of Larissa:

> [6] …the Greeks continued their march unmolested through the remainder
> of the day and arrived at the Tigris river. [7] Here was a large deserted
> city; its name was Larisa, and it was inhabited in ancient times by the
> Medes… [9] Near this city was a pyramid of stone, a plethrum in breadth

¹וחוק מים, בורות, שורות, וחצרות. מחסנים, וישבכים, ובית המבדה. ובית המспешון, וnamese כל שותה ושל חומת הדרור--
וחוק, שלוש עפים מים ליום: שש מתעלו--וחוק, שלוש עפים, ו-Headers מים ליום.
and two plethra in height; and upon this pyramid were many barbarians who had fled away from the neighboring villages. 2 (Anabasis 3.4.6-9)

It seems most likely that the villagers who “had fled away from” (ἀποπεφευγότες) the villages fled to the ziggurat for defensive reasons. Unfortunately, Xenophon does not confirm this and gives no further information about how long they stayed there.

Nevertheless, it is at least possible that it was for reasons other than defense. Xenophon and his army consistently used villages as a source of provisions and had, over the previous two days, encamped at villages that had provided them with food, supplies, and weapons; 250 of the villagers had also joined Xenophon’s army (Anabasis 3.3.20). In the coming days the army would learn that it was easier to defend themselves in a village than while marching on an open plain, with the result that Tissaphernes and his troops began to preemptively burn villages (Anabasis 3.4.31-33; 3.5.3). These particular villagers clearly had not fled at the approach of Xenophon’s army, so it seems at least possible that those in the ziggurat had fled there from villages that had been destroyed (they had obviously abandoned them), either as the result of the actions of the Greek or the Persian armies, and were now living in it. Assuming for the moment that this is the correct interpretation of this passage, I must admit that I have not been able to find another reference to people living in abandoned public buildings in the ancient literature. 3

2 [6] καὶ οἱ μὲν πολέμοι οὐτῶ πράξαντες ἀπέθανον, οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες ἀσφαλῶς πορεύομενοι τὸ λουῆν τῆς ἡμέρας ἀφίκοντο ἐπὶ τὸν Τήρητα ποσαμὸν. [7] ἐναπληθὺ πόλις ἦν ἑρήμη μεγάλη, ὅνωμα δ’ αὐτὴ ἦν Λάρισα· ἢκοινον δ’ αὐτὴν τὸ παλαιὸν Μηδοῦ. τοῦ δὲ τείχους αὐτῆς ἦν τὸ ἐδρὸς πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι πόδες, ὄψος δ’ ἑκατόν· τοῦ δὲ κύκλου ἡ περίοδος δύο παρασάγγαι· ὑκοδόμημα δὲ πλίνθος κεραμεα· κρῆτις δ’ ὑπῆρ πληθὺν λιθῖν τὸ ὑψὸς εἴκοσι ποδῶν. [8] ταύτην βασιλείας Περσῶν ὅτε παρὰ Μηδόν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐλάμβανον Πέρσαι πολιορκῶν οὐδὲν τρόπῳ ἐδύνατο ἔλειν· ἦλον δὲ νεφέλη προκαλύφυσα ἡφάντευσε μέχρι εξέλισσαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ οὕτως ἐλάλ. [9] παρὰ ταύτῃ τὴν πόλιν ἦν πυραμίς λιθῖν, τὸ μὲν ἐδρὸς ἐνὸς πλέθρου, τὸ δὲ ὄψος δύο πλέθρων. ἐπὶ ταύτης πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν πληθίων κομμῶν ἀποπεφευγότες. 3 There are, however, plenty of examples in the ancient literature of people living in caves, tombs, etc., but that is a different phenomenon than living in abandoned public buildings in cities. It is probably not surprising that there are not more references in the extant literature to people inhabiting abandoned
Archaeologically the picture is the reverse. A quick, certainly not comprehensive survey of the archaeological literature shows that domestic rehabilitation of public buildings after they have been abandoned can be found at Galatas (Crete);⁴ Hazor;⁵ Tell Madaba;⁶ possibly in Area S of the Kinneret Regional Project (Israel);⁷ Tell Halif (Israel);⁸ Beit Shean;⁹ Nineveh¹⁰ Nimrud;¹¹ Assur; Khorsabad;¹² Olynthos;¹³ Naxçivan;¹⁴ buildings in antiquity. An informal, imprecise analog can be provided by Google. I searched for “squatters” on the New York Times website and got approximately 35,100 results out of a possible 17,700,000, which means that no more than 0.198% of NY Times web pages include the word. When I expanded the search to include the term “squatter” OR the phrases “living in abandoned buildings,” “living in an abandoned building,” “rehabit* abandoned,” “reinhabit* abandoned,” or “living in an abandoned,” the result was never higher than 135,000 hits, or 0.7627%. The results will have included references that were not actually references to squatting activity (e.g., references to birds living in abandoned buildings), and will have included multiple instances of the same reference (e.g., when the same article is reused in various areas of the website or the same story is covered over weeks or months). The New York Times seemed a good target because it represents a journalistic genre of writing. I would expect that concepts of and problems associated with people living in abandoned buildings to be most highly represented in newspaper articles. To verify this I searched for the same terms and phrases in Google’s ngram viewer (http://books.google.com/ngrams), which searches approximately 5.2 million English-language books written between ca. 1820-2008 and displays the number of times that words or phrases occur according to the publication date of the books in which they occur. The highest rate of occurrence was for the term “squatters,” in the 1970s, when it comprised 0.00015% of the searched words. Given that ancient literature primarily reflected the concerns of the elite and the rich (as a result of education and literacy levels, not to mention the cost of ink and paper), not to mention the difference in genre between most works of antiquity and the New York Times, it is unlikely that there was as great a concern with squatters as there is in modern journalism. Even if it were the same exacts as modern journalistic references, it would have shown up in only ¾ of 1% of ancient literature. Given the small percentage of total literature from antiquity that has survived until today, it is not surprising that I cannot find other ancient references to squatting in public buildings.

⁷ Stratum P-6.
Bylazora (Macedonia);\(^{15}\) Tell Beydar;\(^{16}\) perhaps at Delos;\(^{17}\) perhaps at Gordion;\(^{18}\) at site 11 of the Via Gabina Villas;\(^{19}\) at Jerash;\(^{20}\) at Priniatikos Pyrgos;\(^{21}\) at Paphos;\(^{22}\) at Sardis;\(^{23}\)


14 In the Òğlanqala Citadel, dating to the Hellenistic period. See [http://www.oglanqala.net/2008_Introduction.html](http://www.oglanqala.net/2008_Introduction.html)


18 In the Late Hellenistic period (ca. late 2nd or early 1st century B.C.), or perhaps the period after the 189 B.C. abandonment of the site by the Galatians, recorded by Livy. See G. Kenneth Sams, Brendan Burke, and A. Goldman, "Gordion, 2005," in *Kazi Sonuçlari Toplantısı 2. Cilt*, 2005, ed. B. Koral, H. Dönmez, and M. Akpinar (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Millî Kütüphane Basimevi, 2007).

19 In the 3rd century CE (Context 6 and Squatter Occupation Phase). See Appendix I at [http://viagabina.rice.edu/potsummary/index.html](http://viagabina.rice.edu/potsummary/index.html).
at Kommos (Crete);\textsuperscript{24} in the Amman Citadel;\textsuperscript{25} at Dehes (Syria);\textsuperscript{26} perhaps at Bosra (Syria);\textsuperscript{27} and at Hesban.\textsuperscript{28} In all but one of these cases the squatters inhabited what had been public buildings (e.g., palaces and baths). The architecture of all of these squatting phases, which span from the Iron Age to the Mamluk period, and from Rome to Mesopotamia, is described by excavators in the same way that I have described the Squatters at Kedesh: crudely blocked doorways, beaten earth floors, tabuns, flimsy mud brick or stone partition walls, and makeshift roofs. In most cases the abandonment preceding the rehabilitation was obviously the result of military action and/or destruction.

For instance, the first squatter phase at Bylazora probably began just after the destruction of the city by Philip II of Macedon in 358 BCE. Soon afterward people moved into the propylon, part of the destroyed casemate wall, and some of the terraced buildings, dividing them into smaller compartments by building wattle and daub or clay partition walls; floors were typically beaten earth and a number of small hearths were built.

\textsuperscript{20} In the North Theater complex.
\textsuperscript{21} In the Byzantine period. See http://www.priniatikos.net/TII.html.
\textsuperscript{22} In the theater, dating to the Byzantine period. See the report on trench 1Q – PQ extension at http://sydney.edu.au/arts/archaeology/paphos/site/tr1pq.shtml.
\textsuperscript{25} In the Umayyad Palace at the Amman Citadel. See Bert De Vries, "Archaeology in Jordan," AJA 96, no. 3 (1992), 503-542: 531-533.
\textsuperscript{26} Dating to the 7th century CE.
\textsuperscript{27} Barry Rowney, "Charters and the Ethics of Conservation: A Cross-Cultural Perspective" (Dissertation, University of Adelaide, 2004), 60ff.
However, the case of Bylazora is unique in that their excavators have provided a fairly extensive description of a squatter phase. Most final reports give little more than a passing reference to the squatter phases, due, no doubt, in large part to the ephemeral nature of the remains of such occupation. This situation is sometimes compounded by excavators who are not interested in squatter occupation of “important” governmental and/or monumental buildings.

The possibility that this interpretation fits the pattern found at other sites with the same sort of material remains. In addition, the fact that this is a public building might be instructive. Little to nothing is known about property ownership in Seleucid cities; however, what we know from early Imperial Rome provides a useful analog with which to think about the problem. Only the privileged few could afford to own a single-family dwelling; most rented their homes, often for exorbitant fees. What is interesting is that, even in a city such as Rome that has some degree of infrastructure, however small, to help the poor, there is no concept of public responsibility for constructing sufficient units of housing.29 Where, then, would the dispossessed poor go? There are examples in ancient literature of people moving to the countryside and living in caves and tombs, but why not an abandoned building in town? The only buildings likely to be abandoned are formerly public buildings, as they were well-built enough to still be habitable after years of abandonment and they were not owned by anybody in particular who would charge rent.30

---

30 It is unlikely that the Squatters lost their homes as a result of Jonathan’s army ransacking the city, as there is good evidence of the administrative building having been abandoned for some period of time prior to their arrival. This pattern seems to be replicated in the squatter profiles elsewhere in the Mediterranean (to the degree that they have been published), and it makes sense: a bath house, palace, or other such monumental building would have to begin to fall into disrepair before a society is likely to sufficiently change their conception of it to allow squatting.
Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the Squatters were poor families from Kedesh who moved into the building, how might we explain the sudden appearance of BCW and the seemingly out-of-place nature of the ESA, cast glass, and Rhodian amphoras? The Rhodian amphoras are the easiest to explain. To begin with, there is no reason to assume that the presence of Rhodian wine amphoras necessarily indicates the presence of Rhodian wine. They may well have been reused, as the large storage jars in the Stylobate Corridor were. But even if the Squatters drank three amphoras of Rhodian wine over a 24-28 year period, is that so problematic? It is tempting to interpret beaten earth floors and “crude, flimsy partition walls” in an abandoned civic building as signs of life lived in squalor, probably in large part due to the fact that that is what it would mean in 21st century America. However, not only were the Kedesh Squatter floors not all beaten-earth (we have Squatter-built floors – i.e., not just reused PHAB floors – of crushed limestone or fieldstone pavers in the Stylobate Corridor, the Central Courtyard, and Room C1), but the fact is that we know almost nothing about the urban poor in antiquity aside from evidence in Imperial Roman literature that suggests that many lived in travelers’ hotels and in sections of rental buildings that were poorly lit and often loud. 31 A bronze strainer and an eye of Horus amulet were recovered from the squatter phase in the southwest palace at Nimrud; 32 3 distinctive bronze kohl sticks with castellated heads, 2 triangular bronze fibulae, and 2 stamp seals in Late Babylonian style were found in the squatter phase of the palace of Adad-nirari III; 33 and a silver disc-

31 Juvenal 3.234; Petronius, Satyricon 94ff; Martial 12.57. See Frier, "The Rental Market in Early Imperial Rome," 31, 35.
33 Mallowan, "The Excavations at Nimrud (Kalhu), 1953," 162; Parker, "The Excavations at Nimrud, 1949-1953: Seals and Impressions."
shaped earring, two silver bracelets, a square “silver ornament,” a silver fibula, 5
cylindrical silver beads, 20 miscellaneous beads, and 9 silver coins of Alexander the
Great were found in the squatter levels at Khorsabad.34 The poor might have had fewer
luxuries, but that does not mean that they had none. Aristophanes’ Plutus is instructive in
this regard:35

Chremylus: And what good thing can you give us, unless it be burns in the bath, and
swarms of brats and old women who cry with hunger, and clouds uncountable of
lice, gnats and flies, which hover about the wretch's head, trouble him, awake him
and say, “You will be hungry, but get up!” Besides, to possess a rag in place of a
mantle, a pallet of rushes swarming with bugs, that do not let you close your eyes,
for a bed; a rotten piece of matting for a coverlet; a big stone for a pillow, on
which to lay your head; to eat mallow roots instead of bread, and leaves of
withered radish instead of cake; to have nothing but the cover of a broken jug for
a stool, the stave of a cask, and broken at that, for a kneading-trough, that is the
life you make for us! Are these the mighty benefits with which you pretend to
load mankind?

Poverty: It's not my life that you describe; you are attacking the existence beggars lead.

Chremylus: Is Beggary not Poverty's sister?

Poverty: Thrasybulus and Dionysius are one and the same according to you. No, my life
is not like that and never will be. The beggar, whom you have depicted to us,
ever possesses anything. The poor man lives thriftily and attentive to his work;
he has not got too much, but he does not lack what he really needs.36

These parallels likely explain the cast glass drinking vessels and ESA table ware. As
noted above, there were far fewer cast glass vessels found in Squatter strata than were
found at the relatively wealthy villa at Tel Anafa. And although ESA is classified as “fine
ware,” we have no idea how much it cost in antiquity, and African Red Slip vessels were
the fine ware of the squatters at Site 11 of the Via Gabina Villas. Furthermore, studies of

34 Loud and Altman, Khorsabad II: The Citadel and the Town, 167-170.
35 Aristophanes, Plutus 550-554. This translation is by O’Neill. See Aristophanes, "Wealth," in The
Complete Greek Drama: All the Extant Tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, and the
Comedies of Aristophanes and Menander, in a Variety of Translations, ed. Whitney Jennings Oates and
36 ὤμες γ' ούπερ καὶ Θρασυβοῦλῳ Διονύσιον εἶναι ὁμοιον.
ἀλλ' οὐχ οὕμοις τούτῳ πέπονθεν βίος οὐ' μα Δί', οὐδε γε μέλλει.
πτοχοῦ μὲν γὰρ βίος, ὅν σῦ λέγεις, ξῆν ἔστιν μηδέν ἔργον:
τοῦ δὲ πένητος ζῆν φειδόμενον καὶ τοὺς ἔργοις πρὸς ἔργον,
περιγίγνεσθαι δ' αὐτῷ μηδέν, μή μέντοι μηδ' ἐπιλείπειν.
silver vessels in antiquity have shown that as their manufacture increased in the
Hellenistic period, bronze vessels became middle-class utensils. The same phenomenon
happened with luxury foods in Roman Europe. The presence of ESA in a poor
household context must be analyzed within a broader social and market context than
simply classifying it as “fine ware” and suggesting that the poor would not have
had“nice” implements.

Finally, there is the problem of the arrival of BCW and TGM. As noted in the
previous chapter, there is no reason to connect this pottery with a certain people group,
and there is no reason to think that trade patterns followed ethnic lines. Rather than
replicating early 20th century methodologies that imagine a one-to-one correspondence
between pots and people, thus requiring that material cultural shifts be de facto evidence
of socio-cultural shifts, why not investigate the possibility of a simple economic shift,
coupled with a change in trade patterns subsequent to the end of Kedesh as an
administrative center? The differences between the Squatters at Kedesh and the
inhabitants of the PHAB on the one hand, and between the Squatters and the inhabitants
of the LHSB at Tel Anafa on the other, are far more likely to be economic than cultural.
Furthermore, it must be remembered that what we have at Kedesh is not a material
cultural shift in the city, but a material cultural shift in a palatial administrative building.
The material culture of the PHAB consisted of high quantities of imported pottery from
as far away as the Aegean, the west coast of Italy, and Iberia, and it seems likely that

37 Katerina Panagopoulou, "Between Necessity and Extravagance: Silver as a Commodity in the Hellenistic
38 Corrie Bakels and Stefanie Jacomet, "Access to Luxury Foods in Central Europe During the Roman
39 See Stone, "'Provincial' Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel
Kedesh in a Regional Context."
the administrative building acted as a sort of magnet. Its inhabitants were people of some degree of power and status in the Seleucid Empire, clearly able to afford and import objects of value, all of which came from the sea via Akko. It bears noting that Kedesh is not located on a major thoroughfare through the region. The closest major route, which ran from Akko on the coast or from the Jordan Valley via the Sea of Galilee into the Jezreel Valley and north to Damascus, ran through the Huleh Valley. And although that road was only 4.5 km from Kedesh (or, perhaps, more like 20 km, if it ran up the east side of the Huleh Valley, where Tel Anafa is located; the Valley was a swampy lake in antiquity), it was also more than 400 m. below Kedesh, down a very steep mountain. Is it any wonder, then, that some of their cooking ware was effectively imported as well (in the sense that coarse wares are usually bought locally, yet the PHAB’s came from 45 km away), probably brought in with other items that were coming from the same place? And once those administrators had left the city (there is no reason to think that Kedesh continued to be a center of administration after the building was abandoned), there was no longer such regular traffic bringing imports from the coast. As a result, other merchants stepped in to fill the void – and the only void that was filled was that of the coarse wares – from a much closer proximity. Tel Anafa, on the other hand, had wealthy inhabitants and imported a good deal of Mediterranean fine wares and objects. As a result, some (though not nearly all) of their cooking ware also came from the coast, just like the PHAB.

40 See Roll, “Imperial Roads Across and Trade Routes Beyond the Roman Provinces of Judaea-Palaestina and Arabia: The State of Research.”
41 The numbers of cooking shapes was tabulated for Tel Anafa, but the amounts of each type of cooking ware were not. The inhabitants of Tel Anafa cooked with sandy, gritty, and bricky cooking wares, as well as with Spatter Painted Wares.
Figure 1: Map of the region showing the location of Kedesh and other sites. Map adapted from Berlin and Herbert, "A New Administrative Center," p. 14.
Figure 2: Tel Kedesh with excavation grid. The PHAB is at the southern end of the lower tel. Highway 899 comes toward the tel from the east and runs around the northern end of the upper tel; The Roman temple of Kedesh is northeast of (and below) the PHAB, on the other side of Highway 899.
Figure 3: Aerial photo of the Administrative Building at the end of the 2010 season. The top of the photo is north. Photo taken by SkyView Photography, Ltd.
Figure 4: Plan of the Squatter-phase Administrative Building. Grid numbers, room numbers, and unexcavated areas are shown.
Figure 5: Plan of the Squatter phase showing the location of Squatter-phase coins and Rhodian stamped amphora handles. The density circles have been placed in the rooms (and, where possible, within the quadrant of the room) in which they were found.
Figure 6: Density of Basaltic Cooking Ware (BCW) fragmentary vessels within the Administrative Building. Density circles are centered on the 10 m. x 10 m. trenches, and not on the particular room, in which they were found. Created by Peter Stone and used with permission.
Figure 7: Density of Eastern Sigillata ‘A’ (ESA) fragmentary vessels within the Administrative Building. Density circles are centered on the 10 m. x 10 m. trenches, and not on the particular rooms, in which they were found. Created by Peter Stone and used with permission.
Figure 8: Density of Tan Grey Marl (TGM) fragmentary vessels within the Administrative Building. Density circles are centered on the 10 m. x 10 m. trenches, and not on the particular rooms, in which they were found. Created by Peter Stone and used with permission.
Figure 9: The Administrative Building with Squatter architecture shown in black.
Figure 10: Plan of the Northern Corridor, the Northern Rooms, and the Northern Entrance.
Figure 11: The Northern Corridor, from the east. Cobble surface CB35025 is in the immediate foreground, underneath and east of column drum CB35024. Tabun CB35022/CB36042 is in the distance, covered by black buckets. Photo by Justin Winger.
Figure 12: Tabun CB35022/CB36042, partially excavated, with BCW cookpot K10P056 in situ. Photo by Justin Winger.
Figure 13: Tabun CB35022/CB36042. Top: from the east, showing its placement within the Northern Corridor as well as the pottery, PHAB wall plaster, and stones that were used in the construction of the outer wall. Bottom: Tabun CB35022/CB36042 from the west, after the soil was removed. Photos by Justin Winger.
Figure 14: Plan of Room C1, including C1a and C1b.
Figure 15: Rooms C1 and C1a, view from the east. Troughs CB36033 are visible on the other side of wall CB36036, and pavers CB36017 are visible on the other side of the troughs, abutting walls CB36037 and CB36018, which has been robbed. A Byzantine-era grave rests on top of wall CB36034 on the right side of the photo. South of wall CB36034 is the Central Courtyard floor (CB36035). Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 16: Wall CB36037 and pavers CB36017, view from the south. The foundation level of both the wall and the pavers is clearly visible. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 17: Plan of the Central Courtyard.
Figure 18: Pavement CB37017 in the northwest corner of the Central Courtyard, view from the west. Wall CB37020 is to the left of the pavement. Plaster floor CB37022 is in the lower left corner, partially shaded by the baulk. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 19: Tabun CB37031, in the northwest corner of the Central Courtyard, view from the northeast. Tabun CB37031 (in the Western Corridor) is visible in the background. Note the ashlar embedded in floor CB37026 next to tabun CB37031. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 20: Plaster bin CB26006. Top: from the southwest. The cut in the courtyard floor that may be connected to wall CB16023 is to the right of the bin (cf. Figure ___[the plan of the Courtyard]). Bottom: Detail of plaster bin CB26006. Photos by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 21: Wall CB16023 and stone basin K06S023. Top: view from the east, arrow pointing to CB16023. Bottom: view from the west. Photos by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 22: The southwestern corner of the Central Courtyard, view from the east. The cobble subfloor is plainly visible, as are walls CB27005 and CB27006. The pier-and-rubble wall at the top of the photo is CB27001. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 23: Plan of Room W2.
Figure 24: Room W2. Top: View from the north. Floor CB37023 is visible in the foreground and surface CB37017 (in the Central Courtyard) is in the upper left of the picture, on the other side of wall CB37020. Two outcroppings of floor CB37022 are visible to the right of CB37017, in the shadow of the baulk. Bottom: Room C1b, view from the east. Walls CB36018 and CB36037 are visible in the distance, on the other side of the baulk. Photos by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 25: Door block **CB37003**, between rooms Rooms W2 and N2. Top: View from the south. Bottom: View from the north. Photos by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 26: Room W2, view from the east. Wall CB37005 (on the left) abuts wall CB37001. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 27: Plan of the Western Corridor.
Figure 28: Plan of the Western Corridor (detail). **Left:** The northern half. **Right:** The southern half and Room S2.
Figure 29: The northern half of the Western Corridor, view from the north. The doorway between Rooms N2 and W2 is visible in the foreground and tabun CB37030 sits against the far baulk (Wall CB37005 has been removed). Paving stones CB37032 are pedastalled on this side of the tabun. The difference in elevation between the pavers and the bottom of the tabun walls on one hand, and the threshold of the (final PHAB-phase) doorway on the other, is evident. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 30: Tabun CB37030 and paving stones CB37032, view from the northeast. Tabun CB37031 (in the northwest corner of the Central Courtyard) is visible at the far left. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 31: Plan of Room S2.
Figure 32: A view into Room S2 from the west. Visible are the plaster floor (foreground), cobble subfloor (background), and the lack of any floor in the Western Corridor (immediate foreground). Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 33: Door block CB17071, blocking the doorway between Rooms S2 and S1 (in wall CB17003). Top: Entire room, view from the south (the door blockage is in the northwest corner). Note the plaster on all of the walls but not the door blockage itself. Bottom: Detail, view from the south. Photos by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 34: Doorway between Rooms S2 and S1 (in wall CB17003). Top: View from the north. Door block CB17071 has been partially removed (the two vertical stones against the door jambs were part of the door blocking). Floor CB17052 can be seen connecting to the wall plaster on wall CB27001 in the background. Bottom: View from the north. Floor CB17052 and subfloor CB17052.1 have been removed and one can see the depth to which the vertical blocking stones against the door jambs have been placed. Wall plaster was found to run behind the eastern stone, on the door jamb. Photos by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 35: The doorway between Rooms S2 and S1 and blocking stones CB17071, view from the north. The doorway is in the upper right; the walls that created Room S1 have been removed. The both the ashlar that was used as a stretcher to block the doorway and the blocking stones that were laid against the door jambs are plainly visible, flush with the northern face of wall CB17003. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 36: PHAB-phase doorway blockage between the Stylobate Corridor and the northeastern corner of Room C2 (in wall CB35021). Top: View from the southeast. Top arrow points to facing plaster on the northern door jamb (now in the wall); side arrows point to wall plaster over the blocking stones. Bottom: View from the northeast. Black line outlines where the original doorway was. One large blocking stone is still in situ. Note the wall plaster over it and the original wall. Photos by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 37: Plan of Room C2.
Figure 38: Room C2, view from the north. Tabun CB35001 is visible in the center, sitting on floor CB35003. Floor CB35005 is visible to the east of (and lower than) floor CB35003. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 39: Plan of Room C3.
Figure 40: Rooms C4 and C3, view from the east. Stylobate CB25001 is the wall in the foreground, and the place where wall CB26003 stood can be seen in the middle distance, where mosaic floor CB25004 ends. (The small remaining stublet of CB26003 is visible sticking out of the southern baulk.) The steps leading up from Room C3 into the Central Courtyard are visible in the distance. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 41: Plan of Room C4.
Figure 42: Room C4, view from the east. Paving stones CB25015 are visible just south of wall CB25003, as is line of stones CB25018. The degree of disruption in the room can be seen in the west baulk. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 44. Below: Room C5, view from the north. The base of Hermon Jar K08P064 can be seen sitting on the floor in the southwest corner. Above: ESA mastos K08P022 (left) and BCW cookpot K08P108 (right), which were also found on the floor. Top two photos by Sue Webb; lower photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 45: Plan of Rooms C6 and C7.
Figure 46: Plan of the South-Central Corridor.
Figure 47: Plan of the Stylobate Corridor.
Figure 48: Tabuns CB25004 and CB25005. Above: View from the southeast. Tabun CB25004 has been built up against Stylobate CB25001. Below: Detail, view from the east. Coastal Orange Ware jar CB25005 has been buried upside down and buttressed with soil, stones, and PHAB wall plaster. Photos by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 49: Plan of Room E1.
Figure 50: Plan of Room E2.
Figure 51: Plan of Room E3.
Figure 52: Plan of Room E4.
Figure 53: Tabun CB25041. Top: View from the north. Floor CB25040 can be seen binding to the stones ringing the tabun walls. Bottom: View from the east. Floor CB25042 has been cut for the placement of the tabun. Photos by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 54: Plan of the Eastern Corridor.
Figure 55: Plan of the Northern Corridor, the Northern Rooms (Rooms N3, N4, and N6), and the Northern Entrance.
Figure 56: Plan of the Northwestern Rooms (Rooms N1 and N2).
Figure 57: Plan of the Western Rooms. **Left:** The northern half (Rooms W1, W3, and W4). **Right:** The southern half (Rooms W4a, W5, W6, and W7).
Figure 58: Plaster floor CB28003 in the doorway between Rooms W5 and W4a, view from the south. Above: Detail of door block CB28005, which is visible to the right of two ashlars of wall CB28004 (which sit behind the shattered Hermon Jar) and sitting on soil. Below: the door block has been excavated and floor CB28003 can be clearly seen covering the threshold of the doorway between Rooms W5 and W4a. Photos by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 59: Room W4, view from the north. Note how deeply wall CB28002/CB28016 (the wall dividing Room W4 from the Western Corridor) has been robbed. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 60: Plan of the rooms south of the Central Courtyard (Rooms S2, S3, and S4).
Figure 61: Rooms south of the South-Central Corridor (Rooms S5, S6, S7, S9, S10, and S11).
Figure 62: Plan of Room S8.
Figure 63: Plan of the Southeastern Corridor and the rooms to the south of it (Rooms S12, S14, and S13).
Figure 64: Tabun CB17038 and platform CB17041, view from the south. Note the Rhodian amphora and Hermon Jar sherds that have been incorporated into the construction of the walls. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Figure 65: Tabun CB17039, view from the south. The tabun is difficult to see amidst the rubble that destroyed it, but the curve of its northern face is visible between the arrows. Photo by Sharon Herbert.
Appendix I:
Naming and Numbering Conventions Used in this Dissertation

The Tel
Before exploring the archaeological evidence for the Squatters it is important to set out the conventions that will be used to describe them. The tel is gridded into twelve 90 x 90 m. fields that are further subdivided into 10 x 10 m. squares, each of which have 5 x 5 m. quadrants (see Figure 2 and Figure 4). There are three 90 m-wide east/west fields, designated “East,” “Central,” and “West.” Trenches/squares\textsuperscript{1} are designated by two letters followed by two numbers delineated by a period (e.g., CA 9.6). These East, Central, and West fields account for the first letter in a trench’s designation (e.g., in “CA 9.6” the “C” designates the central 90 m-wide field). Each 90 x 90 m. field’s location on a north/south axis is designated by a letter of the alphabet, starting in the south, which is represents the second letter in a trench’s designation (the “A” in “CA 9.6” indicates that this trench is located in the southernmost 90 x 90 m. section). A 10 x 10 m. square’s location within a 90 x 90 m. field is indicated by the two numbers that follow the two letters. The first number is on the south-north axis and again the progression is from south to north. The second number designates the square’s location on an east/west axis, and these numbers increase from east to west. Thus, for instance, CA 9.5 is southeast of

\textsuperscript{1} In Israel the word “square” is usually used (at least by American excavations) to designate an area that is being excavated – e.g., “square CA 9.6 SE.” The Tel Kedesh Archaeological Excavations, however, most commonly call them “trenches.” Note, however, that “trenches” at Tel Kedesh are square in shape. The terms are completely interchangeable here.
CB 1.6. Each 10 x 10 m. square is further divided into four 5 x 5 m. quadrants, NW, NE, SW, and SE. As a point of reference, the administrative building at Tel Kedesh is located between CB 4.8 NE (the northwest corner of the building), CB 3.3 NE (the northeast corner of the building), CA 9.3 SW (the southeast corner of the building), and CB 1.8 SW (the southwest corner of the building).

**Rooms within the Administrative Building**

For the sake of efficiency, the building has been broken up into use areas and rooms have been numbered within those use areas (see Figure 4). The rooms north of the Northern Corridor have been numbered from 1-6 and in the text are referred to as, e.g., “Room N1.” Rooms west of the Western Corridor have been numbered 1-7 and in the text are referred to as, e.g., “Room W1.” Rooms south of the Central Courtyard, the South-Central Corridor, and the Southeastern Corridor have been numbered from 1-14 and are referred to in the text as, e.g., “Room S1.” Rooms east of the Stylobate Corridor are numbered from 1-4 and are referred to, e.g., as “Room E1.” And rooms in the center of the building (i.e., between the Northern Corridor, the Western Corridor, the South-Central Corridor, and the Stylobate Corridor) are numbered from 1-7 and are referred to as, e.g., “Room C1.” In four cases a part of a room has been given a sub-identifier for the sake of higher resolution with respect to analysis of the finds: The southern portion of room W4 (designated Room W4a); the west, central and eastern 1/3 of Room S8; two areas in Room C1 (C1a and C1b); and one area in Room C2 (C2a).

The following conventions will be also used:

**When a trench is designated without a quadrant specified** (e.g., CA 9.5), it designates an entire 10 x 10 m. square. When the quadrant is specified (e.g., CA 9.5 SW) it designates a 5 x 5 m. square.
A “unit” at Tel Kedesh is the smallest element of excavation – a cohesive three-dimensional deposition of soil that is differentiated from other depositions of soil on the basis of compaction, color, inclusions, or division by architectural features. At the end of a season units are grouped into loci, with a locus being a distinguishable phase of deposition or activity.

**Unit numbers are distinguished from locus numbers by** the inclusion of periods in their designations (e.g., unit CB3.6.034; locus CB36034).

**Architectural loci** will be in bold (e.g., CB37020). It should be noted that some features cross trench lines. When they do and this is relevant to the discussion, they will be designated by all relevant locus numbers (e.g., the northern wall of the Central Courtyard is wall CB36034/CB37020).

**Soil loci** will be boxed (e.g., CB37007).

**Locus numbers that end in “.0”** (e.g., CB37031.0) designate soil that is inside an installation or feature such as a tabun.

**Locus numbers that end in “.1”** (e.g., CB37031.1) designate the soil underneath a feature (ideally 0.1 m. in depth). 0.1 loci nearly always indicate sealed contexts and are therefore important for dating the feature under which they lie.

**Tracking numbers** (e.g., K06T#1326) are underlined and have three parts: the year in which it was excavated (e.g., “K06”), the designation as a tracked object (“T#”), and the tracking number (e.g., “1326”). Every object uncovered in the field (with the exception of pottery sherds in a pottery bucket) was “tracked” and received a tracking number as the first act of registration. If an item was subsequently deemed important enough to be inventoried then it also received an inventory number. In this chapter the use of a tracking number indicates an object that was not inventoried.

**Inventory numbers** (e.g., K06S024) are also underlined and have three parts: the year in which it was excavated (e.g., “K06”), the category of item (e.g., “S” – stone object), and the inventory number (e.g., “024”). The item categories are:

- BD – bead
- BI  – bone implement
- C  – coin
- G  – glass
- I  – inscribed object
- L  – lamp
- M  – metal
- P  – pottery
- S  – stone
- SAH – stamped amphora handle
- TC  – terracotta

**Pottery weights and counts:** Pottery from each unit was washed, sorted, and weighed. When units had an amount of pottery that weighed in below 0.01 kg, the sherds were counted instead of being weighed. When units were combined into loci it sometimes happened that on unit of the locus would have a weight and another would have a sherd count. As a result, there will be times in the following chapter that pottery will be described as, for instance, “0.1 kg, plus 3 sherds, of ESA.”

**Elevations** are given in meters above sea level (e.g., 465.39 m.).
The term “LDM” is short for “Latest Datable Material” and refers to the pottery or object(s) in a unit or locus that provide(s) a terminus post quem for that soil. LDMs in sealed contexts (e.g., sealed below a floor, wall, or installation) usually provide a terminus post quem for the construction of that floor, wall, or installation. It should be noted, however, that the LDM is not always representative of the actual terminus post quem. For instance, a floor that seals soil with a coin of Antiochus III as its LDM might initially seem to have a terminus post quem of 189-188 BCE, based on the reading of the coin. But other factors – for instance, superposition (the floor has been laid over another, deeper floor that has a coin of Demetrius II as its LDM) – might make it clear that the coin of Antiochus III is not representative of the actual terminus post quem.

The term “PHAB” stands for the Persian/Hellenistic Administrative Building and refers specifically to the pre-abandonment (i.e., pre-Squatter) phases of the building (ca. 500 BCE – 143 BCE).
Appendix II:
A Short Primer on the Pottery Found at Tel Kedesh

It would be nice if coins and stamped amphora handles were found in every unit – we would be able to date each unit and locus very precisely. That is sadly not at all the case and so we must rely on pottery to date features. Fortunately we know a lot about the various shapes and types of pottery found at Tel Kedesh and as a result can use it to fairly precisely date the units in which it is found. What follows can be used as a fabric-date concordance for those unfamiliar with the most common pottery fabrics found at Tel Kedesh.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Building Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akko Sandy Cooking Ware</td>
<td>PHAB (Persian to 2nd century BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic Black Glaze</td>
<td>PHAB (Persian to 3rd century BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basaltic Cooking Ware (BCW)</td>
<td>Squatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Slipped Predecessor (BSP)</td>
<td>PHAB (after 160 BCE)-Squatter??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coastal Fine</td>
<td>PHAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Fine North (CFN)</td>
<td>PHAB (200-150 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Orange Ware</td>
<td>PHAB (Persian to 3rd century BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Plain Ware</td>
<td>Iron Age-Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Cooking Ware</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gritty Cooking Ware</td>
<td>PHAB (Persian to 2nd century BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic Black Glaze</td>
<td>PHAB (3rd-2nd centuries BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermon</td>
<td>PHAB (200-150 BCE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ A wide variety of imported fine ware was also found in the PHAB phases (and therefore Squatter phases), but because of the small total amount and great diversity of fabrics and shapes, they are not included in this table. When they are important the date will be included in the text. For details see Stone, "Provincial' Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kfar Hananya</td>
<td>Post-Squatter (mid-1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE to the 6\textsuperscript{th} century CE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Fine B</td>
<td>PHAB (300-150 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Brown Gritty (PBG)</td>
<td>Iron Age and PHAB (Iron Age to early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenician Semi Fine</td>
<td>PHAB (Persian-2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE)/Squatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ras al Fuqra</td>
<td>Early Modern to ca. 1950 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Brown Gritty (RBG)</td>
<td>Iron Age and PHAB (Iron Age to early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatter Ware</td>
<td>Early Bronze Age to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE (PHAB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan Grey Marl</td>
<td>Squatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ware</td>
<td>PHAB (6\textsuperscript{th}-4\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vessel shapes are also important. Not only are they dateable (shapes went in and out of vogue, as they do today), but a given shape can be made in different fabrics. The forms found at Kedesh and references to comparanda are a major focus of Peter Stone’s dissertation on the pottery at Tel Kedesh and can be found there.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{2} Stone, "Provincial' Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh in a Regional Context," Appendix I.
Appendix III:
Greek and English Texts of 1 Maccabees 10:25-45; Ant. 13.48-57;
1 Maccabees 11:18-39; and Ant. 13.121-131

1 Macc. 10:25-45 (NRSV):
King Demetrius to the nation of the Jews, greetings. 26 Since you have kept your
agreement with us and have continued your friendship with us, and have not sided with
our enemies, we have heard of it and rejoiced. 27 Now continue still to keep faith with us,
and we will repay you with good for what you do for us. 28 We will grant you many
immunities and give you gifts. 29 I now free you and exempt all the Jews from payment of
tribute and salt tax and crown levies, 30 and instead of collecting the third of the grain and
the half of the fruit of the trees that I should receive, I release them from this day and
henceforth. I will not collect them from the land of Judah or from the three districts
that are being added to it from Samaria and Galilee, from this day and for all time
(τού λαβεῖν ἀπὸ γῆς Ἰουδαία καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν νομῶν τῶν προστεθέντων αὐτῇ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ Ἑλλάδας). 31 Jerusalem and its environs, its tithes and its revenues,
shall be holy and free from tax. 32 I release also my control of the citadel in Jerusalem and
give it to the high priest, so that he may station in it men of his own choice to guard it.
33 And everyone of the Jews taken as a captive from the land of Judah into any part of my
kingdom, I set free without payment; and let all officials cancel also the taxes on their
livestock. 34 All the festivals and sabbaths and new moons and appointed days, and the
three days before a festival and the three after a festival -- let them all be days of
immunity and release for all the Jews who are in my kingdom. 35 No one shall have
authority to exact anything from them or annoy any of them about any matter. 36 Let Jews
be enrolled in the king's forces to the number of thirty thousand men, and let the
maintenance be given them that is due to all the forces of the king. 37 Let some of them be
stationed in the great strongholds of the king, and let some of them be put in positions of
trust in the kingdom. Let their officers and leaders be of their own number, and let them
live by their own laws, just as the king has commanded in the land of Judah. 38 As for the
three districts that have been added to Judaea from the country of Samaria, let
them be annexed to Judaea so that they may be considered to be under one ruler
and obey no other authority than the high priest (καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς νομοὺς τοὺς προστεθέντας τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας Σαμαρείας προστεθὴ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ πρὸς τὸ
λογισθῆναι τοῦ γενέσθαι υἱῷ ἕνα τοῦ μὴ ὑπακοῦσαι ἄλλης ἐξουσίας ἄλλη ἐκ τοῦ
ἀρχιερέως). 39 Ptolemais and the land adjoining it I have given as a gift to the sanctuary in
Jerusalem, to meet the necessary expenses of the sanctuary. 40 I also grant fifteen thousand
shekels of silver yearly out of the king's revenues from appropriate places. 41 And all the
additional funds that the government officials have not paid as they did in the first years,
they shall give from now on for the service of the temple. 42 Moreover, the five thousand
shekels of silver that my officials have received every year from the income of the services of the temple, this too is canceled, because it belongs to the priests who minister
there.  

43 And all who take refuge at the temple in Jerusalem, or in any of its precincts, because they owe money to the king or are in debt, let them be released and receive back all their property in my kingdom.  

44 Let the cost of rebuilding and restoring the structures of the sanctuary be paid from the revenues of the king.  

45 And let the cost of rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem and fortifying it all around, and the cost of rebuilding the walls in Judaea, also be paid from the revenues of the king.
1 Maccabees 10:25-45 (ed. Rahlfs):

καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοῖς κατὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους βασιλέως Δημήτριος τὸ ἔθιμεν τῶν Ἰουδαίων χαίρειν 26 ἐπεὶ συνετήρησατε τὰς πρὸς ἡμᾶς συνθήκας καὶ ἐνεμείνατε ἡ φιλία ἡμῶν καὶ οὐ προσεχρήσατε τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἡμῶν ἥκουσαμεν καὶ ἔχαρημεν 29 καὶ νῦν ἐμείνατε ἐτὶ τὴν συντήρησαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς πίστιν καὶ ἀνταπόδωσομεν ἡμῖν ἀγαθά ἀνθρωπίνη ὑμᾶς 28 καὶ ἀφήσαμεν ἡμῖν ἀμέσα παλλὰ καὶ δώσομεν ὑμῖν ἀμέσα 29 καὶ νῦν ἀπολύω ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀφήμη πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῶν φόρων καὶ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ ἄλλος καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν στεφάνων 30 καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ τριτοῦ τῆς σπορᾶς καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡμίσους τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ξυλίνου τοῦ ἐπιβαλλούσας μοι λαβεῖν ἀφήμη ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον καὶ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ λαβεῖν ἀπὸ γῆς Ἰουδαί καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τριών νομῶν τῶν προστιθεμένων αὐτῆ ἀπὸ τῆς Σαμαρίτιδος καὶ Γαλατίας ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀπαντα χρόνον 31 καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐτῶν ἁγίας καὶ ἀφειμένη καὶ τὸ δρόμα αὐτῆς αἱ δεκάται καὶ τὰ τέλη 32 ἀφήμη καὶ τὴν ἔξοδον τῆς ἀκρας τῆς ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ δίδωμι τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ ὡς ἀν καταστήσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ ἄνδρας ως ἂν αὐτὸς ἐκλέξῃ τοῦ φυλάσσειν καὶ πάσαν ψυχήν Ἰουδαίων τὴν αἰχμαλωτισθένας ἀπὸ γῆς Ἰουδαί εἰς πάσαν βασιλείαν μου ἀφήμη ἐλευθέραν ὄφειαν καὶ πάντες ἀφήτωσαν τοὺς φόρους καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν αὐτῶν καὶ πάσαι αἱ ἐσοραὶ καὶ τὰ σάββατα καὶ νομιμαί καὶ ἡμέρας ἀπωδειγμέναι καὶ τρεῖς ἡμέραι πρὸ ἐορτῆς καὶ τρεῖς μετὰ ἐορτῆς ἐσωτερὰ πάσαις ἡμέραις ἀτελείας καὶ ἀφέσεως πάσαις τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου καὶ σὺς ἔξει ἱεροῦ ὑμῶν πράσον καὶ παρασαλέειν τινα αὐτῶν περὶ πάντων πράγματας καὶ προγραφήσωσαν τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὰς δυνάμεις τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς τριάκοντα χιλίας ἄνδρῶν καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτοῖς ἔξιν ἦς καθήκη πάσας ταῖς δυνάμεις τοῦ βασιλείας καὶ κατασταθήσεται ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς ὑποχρωμαίς τοῦ βασιλείας τοῖς μεγάλοις καὶ ἐκ τούτων καταστάθησονται ἐπὶ χρείαν τῆς βασιλείας τῶν ὄνων εἰς ποτίνι καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς ἐσωτερὰ πάσων αὐτῶν καὶ παρεσώθησαν τοῖς νόμων αὐτῶν καθα καὶ προσέληξεν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν γῇ Ἰουδα 38 καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς νομοὺς τοὺς προστεθέντας τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας Σαμαρείας προστεθήσεται τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ πρὸς τὸ λογισθῆναι τοῦ γενεσθαι ὡς ἐν τοῦ μὴ ὑπακούσαν ἄλλης ἔξοδος ἀλλ’ ἦ τοῦ ἀρχιερεῶς 39 Πτολεμαίδα καὶ τὴν προσπυροῦσαν αὐτῆς δεδώκα δόμα τοῖς ἀγίοις τοῖς ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ εἰς τὴν καθήκοναν δαπάνην τοῖς ἀγίοις 40 καὶ δίδωμι καὶ ἐναυτοῦ δέκα πέντε χιλιάδας σίκλων ἀργυρίου ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ βασιλέως ἀπὸ τῶν τόπων τῶν ἀντικώντων 41 καὶ πάν τὸ πλεονάζη ὦ σὺς ἀπεδίδοσαν ἀπὸ τῶν χρείας ὡς ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ἔτεσιν ἀπὸ τῶν νῦν δώσομεν εἰς τὰ ἔργα τοῦ αἰῶνος 42 καὶ ἐπὶ τούτως πεντακαιχιλίους σίκλων ἀργυρίου ὧς ἐλάμβανον ἀπὸ τῶν χρείας τοῦ ἁγίου ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου κατ’ ἐναυτόν τοῦτο αὕτη ἄφησεν αὐτοὶ τοῖς Ιερεὺς τοῖς πεντακαιχιλίοις 43 καὶ ὄσοι ἔδωκαν τὸ ἔργον τὸ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ ἐν πάσιν τοῖς ὄριοις αὐτοῦ ἀργυρίου βασιλικαὶ καὶ πανέμορφα ἀπολύσασθαι καὶ πάντα δώσῃ ἐστιν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου καὶ τοῦ ῥυθμὸν ἐπικακνισθήσεται τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἡ δαπάνη δοθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ βασιλέως 44 καὶ τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ ἐπικακνισθήσεται τὰ τέλη Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ ἀργυρώσει κυκλοθήκεν καὶ ὡς δαπάνη δοθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ ἐπικακνισθήσεται τὰ τέλη ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ

Ant. 13.48-57 (transl. Whiston):  

“King Demetrius to Jonathan, and to the nation of the Jews, sends greetings. Since you have preserved your friendship for us, and when you have been tempted by our enemies, you have not joined yourselves to them; I both commend you for your fidelity, and exhort you to continue in the same disposition; for which you shall be repaid, and receive rewards from us; for I will free you from the greatest part of the tributes and taxes which you formerly paid to the kings my predecessors, and to myself; and I do now set you free from those tributes which you have ever paid; and besides, I forgive you the tax upon salt, and the value of the crowns which you used to offer to me: and instead of the third part of the fruits of the field, and the half of the fruits of the trees, I relinquish my part of them from this day: and as to the poll money, which ought to be given me for every head of the inhabitants of Judaea, and of the three toparchies that adjoin to Judaea, Samaria, and Galilee, and Peraea, that I relinquish to you for this time, and for all time to come. I will also, that the city of Jerusalem be holy and inviolable, and free from the tithes, and from the taxes, to its utmost bounds: and I so far recede from my title to the citadel, as to permit Jonathan your high priest to possess it, that he may place such a garrison in it as he approves of for fidelity and goodwill to himself, that they may keep it for us. I also make free all those Jews who have been made captives and slaves in my kingdom. I also order that the beasts of the Jews be not pressed for our service; and let their Sabbaths, and all their festivals, and three days before each of them, be free from any imposition. In the same manner, I set free the Jews that are inhabitants of my kingdom, and order that no injury be done to them. I also give permission to those who are willing to enlist themselves in my army, that they may do it, and those as many as thirty thousand; which Jewish soldiers, wherever they go, shall have the same pay that my own army has; and some of them I will place in my garrisons, and some as guards about mine own body, and as rulers over those who are in my court. I give them permission also to use the laws of their forefathers, and to observe them; and I will that they have power over the three toparchies that are added to Judaea; and it shall be in the power of the high priest to take care that no one Jew shall have any other temple for worship but only that at Jerusalem. I bequeath also, out of my own revenues, yearly, for the expenses about the sacrifices, one hundred and fifty thousand [drachmas]; and what money is to spare, I will that it shall be your own. I also release to you those ten thousand drachmas which the kings received from the temple, because they appertain to the priests that minister in that temple. And whoever shall flee to the temple at Jerusalem, or to the places thereto belonging, or who owe the king money, or are there on any other account, let them be set free, and let their goods be in safety. I also give you permission to repair and rebuild your temple, and that all be done at my expense. I also allow you to build the walls of your city, and to erect high towers, and that they be erected at my charge. And if there be any fortified town that would be convenient for the Jewish country to have very strong, let it be so built at my expense.”

κατοικούντων καὶ τῶν τριῶν τοπαρχιῶν τῶν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ προσκεμένων Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλικίας καὶ Περαιάς τούτους παραχώρη ὤμην ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅπως εἰς τὸν ἀπαντὰ χρόνον 51 καὶ τὴν Ἰεροσολυμίτων πάλιν ἱερὰν καὶ θαυμὸν εἶναι βουλομένη καὶ ἐλευθέραν ἑως τῶν ὀρων αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τῆς δικαίης καὶ τῶν τελῶν τὴν δὲ ἀκραν ἐπιτρέπω τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ ὦμην Ἰωάννην οὖς δ’ ἂν αὐτὸς δοκιμάσῃ πιστῶς καὶ φίλους τούτους ἐν αὐτῇ φρουροῖς καταστήσας ἐνα φυλάσσωσιν ὤμην αὐτήν 52 καὶ Ἰουδαίων δὲ τοὺς αἰχμαλωτισθέντας καὶ δουλεύοντας ἐν τῇ ἡμέτερα ἀφίμην ἐλευθεροὺς κελεύω ἡ μηδὲ ἀγγαρεύσῃ τὰ Ἰουδαίων ὑποζύγια τὰ δὲ σάββατα καὶ ἐορτὴν ἀπασάν καὶ τρεῖς καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐορτῆς ἡμέρας ἐστόσωσιν ἅτελεις 53 τοῦ αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἡμή κατοικούντας Ἰουδαίους ἐλευθεροὺς καὶ ἀνεπτρεπόντας ἀφίμην καὶ τοῖς στρατεύοντες μετ’ ἐμὸν βουλομένους ἐπιτρέπω καὶ μέχρις τρισιμιστῶν ἐξεστὸ τούτῳ τῶν δ’ αὐτῶν ὅποι ἂν ἀπίστω τείχονται ὡς καὶ τὸ ἐμὸν στρατεύμα μεταλαμβάνει καταστήσω δ’ αὐτῶν οὖς μὲν εἰς τὰ φρούρια τινὰς δὲ πρὶν τὴν φυλακὴν τοιοῦτος αὐτῶς καὶ ἡμεμάμην δὲ ποιήσω τῶν περὶ τὴν ἡμήν αὐλὴν 54 ἐπιπρέπεις δὲ καὶ τοῖς πατρίδοις χρησάμενοι νόμοις καὶ τοῦτος φιλάττειν καὶ τοῖς τριχῶν τοῖς προσκεμένων τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ νόμοις ὑποτάσσεσθαι βουλομένη καὶ τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ ἐπιπρέπεις δὲ ἐπιμελεῖς εἶναι ἐν μηδὲ εἰς Ἰουδαίος ἄλλο ἔχῃ ἱερὸν προσκυνεῖν ὁ μόνον τὸ ἐν Ἰεροσολύμωι 55 δίδωμι δ’ ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν καὶ εἰς τὴν διαπάνω τῶν θυσιῶν κατ’ ἔτος μυριάδος πεντεκαίδεκα τὰ δὲ περισσεύοντα τῶν χρημάτων ἡμέτερα εἶναι βουλομένη τὰς δὲ μυρίας δραχμὰς ὡς ἐλάμβανον ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς ὦμην ἀφίμην διὰ τὸ προσήκειν αὐτὰς τοῖς ἱερεῖσιν τοῖς λειτουργοῦσιν τῷ ἱερῷ 56 καὶ ὁσὶ δ’ ἂν φύγωσιν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν Ἰεροσολύμωι καὶ εἰς τὰ ἀπ’ αὐτὸς χρηματίζοντας ἤ βασιλικὰ ὀφείλοντες χρήματα ἢ δ’ ἀλλὰ σπηλαίῳ ἀπολελυσθῶσιν οὗτοι καὶ τὰ ἑπάρχοντα αὐτοῖς αὐτὰς ἡμῶν ἐστοῖ 57 ἐπιπρέπεις δὲ καὶ ἀνακαίνιζεν τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἰκοδομὸν τῆς εἰς ταῦτα διαπάνη ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν γυναικείας καὶ τὰ τείχη δὲ συγχωρῶ τὰς τῆς πόλεως ἰκοδομεῖσαι καὶ πύργους υψόλους ἐγένετο καὶ ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν ἀνιστὰν πάντα εἷς δὲ τι καὶ φυσικὰς ἐστὶν δ’ συμφέρει τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ Ἰουδαίϊς ὄχυρον εἶναι καὶ τοῦτ’ ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν κατασκευασθήτω

3 Josephus and Niese, Flavii Iosephi Opera: edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Benedictus Niese.
1 Macc. 11:18-39 (NRSV):
But King Ptolemy died three days later, and his troops in the strongholds were killed by the inhabitants of the strongholds. 19 So Demetrius became king in the one hundred sixty-seventh year. 20 In those days Jonathan assembled the Judaeans to attack the citadel in Jerusalem, and he built many engines of war to use against it. 21 But certain renegades who hated their nation went to the king and reported to him that Jonathan was besieging the citadel. 22 When he heard this he was angry, and as soon as he heard it he set out and came to Ptolemais; and he wrote Jonathan not to continue the siege, but to meet him for a conference at Ptolemais as quickly as possible. 23 When Jonathan heard this, he gave orders to continue the siege. He chose some of the elders of Israel and some of the priests, and put himself in danger, 24 for he went to the king at Ptolemais, taking silver and gold and clothing and numerous other gifts. And he won his favor. 25 Although certain renegades of his nation kept making complaints against him, 26 the king treated him as his predecessors had treated him; he exalted him in the presence of all his Friends. 27 He confirmed him in the high priesthood and in as many other honors as he had formerly had, and caused him to be reckoned among his chief Friends. 28 Then Jonathan asked the king to free Judaea and the three districts of Samaria 1 from tribute, and promised him three hundred talents. 29 The king consented, and wrote a letter to Jonathan about all these things; its contents were as follows: 30 "King Demetrius to his brother Jonathan and to the nation of the Jews, greetings. 31 This copy of the letter that we wrote concerning you to our kinsman Lasthenes we have written to you also, so that you may know what it says. 32 King Demetrius to his father Lasthenes, greetings. 33 We have determined to do good to the nation of the Jews, who are our friends and fulfill their obligations to us, because of the goodwill they show toward us. 34 We have confirmed as their possession both the territory of Judaea and the three districts of Aphairema and Lydda and Rathamin; the latter, with all the region bordering them, were added to Judaea from Samaria. To all those who offer sacrifice in Jerusalem we have granted release from 1 the royal taxes that the king formerly received from them each year, from the crops of the land and the fruit of the trees. 35 And the other payments henceforth due to us of the tithes, and the taxes due to us, and the salt pits and the crown taxes due to us -- from all these we shall grant them release. 36 And not one of these grants shall be canceled from this time on forever. 37 Now therefore take care to make a copy of this, and let it be given to Jonathan and put up in a conspicuous place on the holy mountain." 38 When King Demetrius saw that the land was quiet before him and that there was no opposition to him, he dismissed all his troops, all of them to their own homes, except the foreign troops that he had recruited from the islands of the nations. So all the troops who had served under his predecessors hated him. 39 A certain Trypho had formerly been one of Alexander's supporters; he saw that all the troops were grumbling against Demetrius. So he went to Imalkue the Arab, who was bringing up Antiochus, the young son of Alexander…
1 Macc. 11:18-39 (ed. Rahlfs): ⁴
καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος ἀπέθανεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ οἱ ὄντες ἐν τοῖς ὄχυρομασίν αὐτοῦ ἀπάλωσαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὄχυρομασίν ⁵ καὶ ἔβασιέν τε Πτολεμαῖος ἐτοὺς ἐβδόμου καὶ ἐξηκοστοὺς καὶ ἐκατοστοὺς ⁶· εἰς ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις συνήγαγεν Ἰωάνναν τοῖς ἑκ ἐκ τῆς ἐκτελομένης τὴν ἀκραν τὴν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ ἐποίησαν ἐπὶ αὗτῶν μηχανάς πολλάς ⁷· καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν τινες μισοῦντες τὸ έθνος αὐτῶν ἀνδρὲς παράνομοι πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἰωάνναν περικάθηται τὴν ἀκραν ⁸· καὶ ἄκοισας ὄργιαν ὡς ὑ ἔκουσεν εὐθέως ἀναζεύχησεν ἦλθεν εἰς Πτολεμαίδα καὶ ἔγραψεν Ἰωάνναν τῷ μὴ περικάθησαν καὶ τοῦ ἀπαντήσαν αὐτῶν αὐτῷ συμμισέσθηνει εἰς Πτολεμαίδα τῇ ταχύτητι ⁹· καὶ ἔκουσεν Ἰωάνναν ἐκέλευσαν περικάθησαι καὶ ἐπέλεξαν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων Ἰσαρηλ καὶ τῶν ἰερέως καὶ ἑδωκεν εὐαγγέλια τῷ κυνδύνῳ ¹⁰· καὶ λαβὼν ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον καὶ ἰματίσματι καὶ ἕτερα ξένα πλεονά καὶ ἐπορεύθη πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα εἰς Πτολεμαίδα καὶ εὑρεν χάριν ἐναντίον αὐτῶν ¹¹· καὶ ἐνετυγχάναν κατ’ αὐτῶν τινές ἀνυμαι τῶν ἐκ τοῦ έθνος ¹²· καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὁ βασιλεὺς καθὼς ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ οἱ πρὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔφυσεν αὐτοῦ ἐναντίον τῶν φιλῶν αὐτοῦ πάντων ¹³· καὶ ἐστηκαν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀρχιερασίαν καὶ ὑπό ἐλαχίστων τὸ πρῶτον καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῶν τῶν πρῶτων φιλῶν ἡγείσθη ¹⁴· καὶ ἠλέσαν Ἰωάνναν τὸν βασιλέα ποίησαν τῇ Ιουδαιαν ἀφορολόγητον καὶ τὰς τρεῖς τοπαρχίας καὶ τὴν Σαμαρίτην καὶ ἐπηγγείλατο αὐτῷ τάλαντα τριακάσια ¹⁵· καὶ εὐδόκησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἔγραψε τῷ Ἰωάνναν ἐπιστολάς περὶ πάντων τούτων ἑγούσας τὴν τρόπον τούτου ¹⁶· βασιλεὺς Δημήτριος Ἰωάνναν τῷ ἀδελφῷ χαίρειν καὶ ἔθνει Ἰουδαίων ¹⁷· τὸ αντίγραφον τῆς επιστολῆς ἡς ἐγράφαμεν Ἀσαθείες τῷ συγγενεῖ ἡμῶν περὶ ἑαυτῶν γεγραμμένι καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτῆς ὅπως εἴδητε ¹⁸· βασιλεὺς Δημήτριος Ἀσαθείες τῷ πατρὶ χαίρειν ¹⁹· τῷ ἔθνει τῶν Ἰουδαίων φύλος ἡμῶν καὶ συντροφίταιν τὸ πρὸς ἡμᾶς δίκαια ἐκρίναμεν ἁγαθον ποιήσας χάριν τῆς ἐσ αὐτῶν εὐνοίασ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ²⁰· εστακάμεν αὐτοῖς τὰ τε θριαὶ τῆς Ιουδαιᾶς καὶ τοῖς τρεῖς νομοῖς Αφαρείμης καὶ Λυδᾶ καὶ Ῥαθαιμ ροσετεύσαν τῇ Ιουδαιᾷ ἀπὸ τῆς Σαμαρητίδος καὶ πάντα τὰ συγκυριώτα ἀυτοῖς πᾶσιν τοῖς θυσιάζομεν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ ἀντὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν ὤν ἐλάβαμεν ὁ βασιλεὺς παρ’ αὐτῶν τὸ πρῶτον κατ’ ἐναυτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν γενημάτων τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἀγρυδρῶν ²¹· καὶ ἄλλα τὰ ἀνήκοντα ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν τῶν δεκατῶν καὶ τῶν τελῶν τῶν ἀνήκοντων ἡμῖν καὶ τῶν τῶν ἀδήλων λίμνων καὶ τῶν ἀνήκοντων ἡμῖν στεφάνους πάντα ἐπαρκέσομεν αὐτοῖς: καὶ οὐκ ἀδειχθήσεται οὐδὲ ἐν τούτως ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν εἰς τῶν ἀπαντὰ χρόνων ²²· τῶν δέ ἐπεμέλεσθη τοῦ ποίησαν τούτων αντίγραφον καὶ δοθήτω Ἰωάθαν καὶ τέθησάν τοι ὡς ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτῆς ἐν τῷ άγου ἐν τῷ ἑπιστήμῃ ²³· καὶ εἶδεν Δημήτριος ὁ βασιλεὺς ὅτι ἤσχασεν ἡ γῆ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐδέν αὐτῷ ἀνθειστήκην καὶ ἀπέλυσεν πᾶσας τὰς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ ἐξακοστὸν εἰς τὸν Τιττὸν τὸν πληθν λόγων ἐνῶν δυνάμεων ὁ ἐξενολόγησεν ἀπὸ τῶν νησίων τῶν έθνῶν καὶ ἠθέταν αὐτῷ πᾶσα αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν πατέρων ²⁴· Γρύφως δὲ τῇ χεὶς τὸν παρὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου τὸ πρῶτον καὶ εἶδεν ὅτι πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις καταγγύζουσιν κατὰ τὸν Δημητρίον καὶ ἐπορεύθη πρὸς Ἰμαλκοῦ τὸν Ἀραβὰ δ’ ἔστρεφεν Ἰατροί οἱ παθόροι τοῦ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου.
But Jonathan the high priest levied an army out of all Judaea, and attacked the citadel at Jerusalem, and besieged it. It was held by a garrison of Macedonians, and by some of those wicked men who had deserted the customs of their forefathers. These men at first despised the attempts of Jonathan for taking the place, as depending on its strength; but some of those wicked men went out by night, and came to Demetrius, and informed him that the citadel was besieged; who was irritated with what he heard, and took his army, and came from Antioch, against Jonathan. And when he was at Antioch, he wrote to him, and commanded him to come to him quickly to Ptolemais; upon which Jonathan did not stop the siege of the citadel, but took with him the elders of the people, and the priests, and carried with him gold, and silver, and garments, and a great number of presents of friendship, and came to Demetrius, and presented him with them, and thereby pacified the king's anger. So he was honoured by him, and received from him the confirmation of his high priesthood, just as he had possessed it by the grants of the kings his predecessors. And when the Jewish deserters accused him, Demetrius was so far from giving credit to them, that when he petitioned him that he would demand no more than three hundred talents for the tribute of all Judaea, and the three toparchies of Samaria, and Peraea, and Galilee, he complied with the proposal, and gave him a letter confirming all those grants; whose contents were as follows: King Demetrius to Jonathan his brother, and to the nation of the Jews, sends greetings. We have sent you a copy of that letter which we have written to Lasthenes our kinsman, that you may know its contents. King Demetrius to Lasthenes our father, sends greetings. I have determined to return thanks, and to show favour to the nation of the Jews, which has observed the rules of justice in our concerns. Accordingly, I remit to them the three districts, Aphairema, and Lydda, and Ramatha, which have been added to Judaea out of Samaria, with what appertains to them; as also what the kings my predecessors received from those who offered sacrifices in Jerusalem, and what are due from the fruits of the earth, and of the trees, and what else belongs to us; with the salt pits, and the crowns that used to be presented to us. Nor shall they be compelled to pay any of those taxes from this time on. Take care, therefore, that a copy of this letter be taken, and given to Jonathan, and be set up in an eminent place of their holy temple.

And these were the contents of this writing. And now when Demetrius saw that there was peace everywhere, and that there was no danger, nor fear of war, he disbanded the greatest part of his army, and diminished their pay, and even retained in pay no others than such foreigners as came up with him from Crete, and from the other islands. However, this procured him ill will and hatred from the soldiers; on whom he bestowed nothing from this time, while the kings before him used to pay them in time of peace, as they did before, that they might have their goodwill, and that they might be very ready to undergo the difficulties of war, if any occasion should require it. Now there was a certain commander of Alexander's forces, an Apanemian by birth, whose name was Diodotus, and was also called Tryphon, took notice the ill will of the soldiers bare to Demetrius, and went to Malchus the Arabian, who brought up Antiochus, the son of Alexander, and told him what ill will the army bore toward Demetrius, and persuaded him to give him Antiochus, because he would make him king, and recover for him the kingdom of his father.


τοιούθες δ’ ἐγὼ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐξ ἀπάσις τῆς Ἰουδαίας στρατιῶν συναγαγὼν προσβαλὼν ἐπολύρκει τὴν ἐν τοῖς Ἰεροσολύμωις ἄκραν ἐξοσον Ἱσραηλικὴν φρουρὰν καὶ τῶν ἁσεβῶν τινας καὶ πεφυγότων τὴν πάτριον συνήθειαν 122 οὕτως δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον κατεφρόνυν ὄν Ἰωναθῆς ἐμιμχαῖότο περὶ τὴν αἵρεσιν πεπτυκυκτείς τὴν ὁχυρώτητι τοῦ χωρίου νικὸς δὲ τινες τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ ποιημάτων ἐξελθόντες ἦκον πρὸς Ἀντιόκχον καὶ τὴν πολιορκίαν αὐτῷ τῆς ἁκρᾶς ἐμίμησεν 123 οὗ δὲ τοὺς ἠγγελίαντες παραξύνθες ἀναλαμβάνων τὴν ὅρμων ἦκεν ἐκ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰωναθῆν γενόμενος δὲ ἐν Πτολεμαῖοι γράφει κελεύνων αὐτὸν σπείραι πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς Πτολεμαίαν 124 οὗ δὲ τὸ μὲν πολιορκίαν οὐκ ἔπαισεν τοῖς δὲ πρεσβυτέροντος τοὺς λαοῦ παραλαβὼν καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ χρυσῶν καὶ ἄργυρου καὶ ἐσθήτα καὶ πλῆθος ξένων κομίζων ἦκεν πρὸς τὸν Δημήτριον καὶ τούτους δυσρησίμους αὐτὸν θεραπεύει τὴν ἀρχήν του βασιλείας καὶ τημισθείς ὅπ’ αὐτοῦ λαμβάνει βεβαιαν ἔχειν τὴν ἀρχηγοτητήν καθὼς καὶ παρὰ τοῦ πρὸς αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν ἐκέκτητο 125 κατηγορούντων δὲ αὐτοῦ τῶν φυγάδων ὁ Δημήτριος οὐκ ἔποιεσεν ἀλλὰ καὶ παρακαλέσαντός αὐτὸν ὅπως ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀπάσης καὶ τῶν τριῶν τοπορχῶν Σαμαρείας καὶ Ἰώσπος καὶ Γαλατίας τριακοῦντα τελῆ τάλαντα δίδωσιν καὶ περὶ πάντων ἐπιστολάς α’ περείχον τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον 126 βασιλείας Δημήτριος Ἰωναθῆ ςοφός καὶ τῷ θεν τῶν Ἰουδαίων χαίρειν τὸ ἀντίγραφόν της ἐπιστολῆς ἡ ἑγγύα ἐλαθένει τῷ συγγενεῖ ἡμῶν ἀπεστάλκαμεν ἰμαῖν ἵνα εἰδήσῃ 127 βασιλείας Δημήτριος ἐλαθένει τῷ πατρὶ χαίρειν τῷ Ἰουδαίων ξεθεὶς δυντὶ φίλῳ καὶ τὰ δίκαια τα πρὸς ἡμᾶς φυλάττοντι τῆς εὐνοίας ἐκρίνα χέριν παρασειρέων καὶ τοῖς τρεῖς νομίζον Αἰκαίρεμα καὶ Λύδδα καὶ Ραμάθαιν οὗ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ προσετέθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος καὶ τὰ προσκυροῦντα τούτοις 128 ἐπὶ τα δόσα παρὰ τῶν θυσίων ἐν Ἰεροσολυμίωις ἐλάμβαναν οἱ πρὸς ἔμοι βασιλεῖς καὶ δοσά ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν φυτῶν καὶ τάλλα τὰ προσηκοῦντα ἡμῖν καὶ τὰς λίμνας τῶν ἀλῶν καὶ τοὺς κομιζόμενους ἡμῖν στεφάνους ἀφήμι αὐτοῖς καὶ οὖθεν παραβιβαζοῦσθαι τούτων ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδὲ εἰς τὸν ἄπαντα χρόνου φρόντισον οὖν ἡμῖν τοῦτον ἀντίγραφον γεννηται καὶ δοθῇ Ἰωναθῆ 129 καὶ ἐν ἐπιστολῇ τῷ τοῦ ἀγίου ἱεροῦ τεθήν τὰ μὲν δὴ γραφεῖται ταύτα τὴν ὅρων δὲ ὁ Δημήτριος εἰρήνην οὐσαν καὶ μηδένα κῤύδουν μηδὲ πολέμου φόρον ὑπάρχοντα διέλυσε τὴν στρατιὰν καὶ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν ἐμείωσε καὶ μόνος τοῦτον ἐχορήγη τοῖς ἐξουθενηθέσιν οἱ συνικέφθησαν ἐκ Κρήτης αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκ τῶν άλλων ἱστορῶν 130 εὐχαρι ὑποφεροῦντα τοιχαρων αὐτῷ καὶ μίσος ἐκ τοῦτον γίνεται παρὰ τῶν στρατιωτῶν σις αὐτῶς μὲν οὖθεν οὐκέτι παρέχειν οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν βασιλεῖς καὶ ἐπ’ εἰρήνης χειργοῦντες αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως διετέλους ἐν ἐναδιαμόνευσον ἐξοσον καὶ ἐν τοῖς υπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀγῶνιν εἰ δεσποτεῖς ποὸν πρόδισμος. Αμέλει ταύτην νόημας τὴν δύναμαν τῶν στρατιωτῶν πρὸς Δημήτριον Ἀλέξανδρος τῆς στρατιᾷ Ἀπαμεῖς τὴν γένους Διόδοτος ὁ καὶ Τρύφῳ ἐπικληθεῖς παραγινεῖται πρὸς Μάλχον τὸν Ἀραβαῖον ὁ ἔτερος τοῦ Ἀλέξανδρου υἱὸν Ἀντίοχον καὶ δηλώσας αὐτῷ τὴν ὅρμων τοῖς τοῖς στρατομεῖο πρὸς Δημήτριον ἐπέειδθεν αὐτῷ δοῦναι τὸν Ἀντίοχον βασιλεὺς γὰρ αὐτὸν ποιήσειν καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτῷ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀποκαταστήσειν

6 Josephus and Niese, Flavii Iosephi Opera: edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Benedictus Niese.
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