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We present the main findings of three excavation seasons at Kedesh. At the southern end of the lower mound we have uncovered an enormous Hellenistic building (56 m east-west by 40 m north-south), abandoned shortly after the middle of the second century B.C.E. and built over a Persian-period predecessor. The size, internal fittings, and especially the finds of the Hellenistic building—including an archive represented by 2043 stamped clay sealings—indicate that this was a public administrative center, probably housing either the governor of the eparchy of Galilee or the strategos of Coele-Syria. The finds show compelling affinities with the material culture of Hellenistic Phoenicia with a considerable admixture of Greek culture. Some parts of the building were reoccupied shortly after its abandonment by people living in a much less grandiose manner, but whose material culture also reflects Hellenistic Phoenician remains. These discoveries are relevant to larger historical issues, including the Persian administration of the region from the fifth century B.C.E., and relations between the Tyrians, the Seleucids, and the Jews in the first half of the second century B.C.E. The nature and timing of the abrupt dissolution of this administrative base just after the middle of the second century B.C.E. reflect significant changes in the balance of power in the region, which we believe are relevant to contemporary developments in Judaea.

INTRODUCTION

Kedesh of the Upper Galilee is located about 10 km northwest of Hazor some 450 m above sea level on the land of Kibbutz Malkiya (fig. 1). It is a large double mound measuring over 900 m from north to south and covering 30 ha (about 22–25 acres). There is a steep northern acropolis that descends to a flat plateau running some 400 m to the south. The north edge of the tel is cut by a modern road. Situated in one of the richest agricultural zones of modern Israel, the area of Kedesh has been home since antiquity to a changing tapestry of cultural and ethnic groups, from Canaanites to the Israelite tribe of Naphtali to Phoenicians from the nearby city of Tyre. The most recent occupants of the site were Palestinian villagers who left in 1948 (Khalidi 1992: 384–85).

There are a number of ancient settlements named Kedesh/Kadesh. Among these are Kadesh Barnea in the northern Sinai, Kedesh (Tell Abu-Qudeis) in the Jezreel Valley, Khirbet Kedesh near the southeastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, and, of course, the famous Syrian site of the battles between the Hittites, under Suppiluliuma I and the New Kingdom Egyptian pharaohs Seti I and Rameses II in the early 13th century B.C.E. Our site, Kedesh of the Upper Galilee, can be recognized in ancient sources by references to its mountainous terrain and its northern location on a route from Hazor to Tyre. The earliest reference may be in the second group of Egyptian Execration Texts, dating from the 19th century B.C.E. (Aharoni
Fig. 1. Map showing location of site.
is the area of the site's first scientific explorations. In 1953, Yohanan Aharoni excavated a 17 m-long step trench along the mound's northwestern slope. He found pottery and architecture dating to the Early Bronze Age; abundant pottery from the Middle Bronze Age; and scattered pottery of the Late Bronze Age, and the Iron I, II, Hellenistic, and Arab periods. The deposits were of varying depth, and the narrow confines of the excavation meant that both the extent and the precise chronology of each period's occupation were unclear. On the basis of his findings here as well as his extensive surveys throughout Galilee (Aharoni 1957), Aharoni concluded that this Kedesh must be the mighty Canaanite city cited in the conquest narrative in the book of Joshua 12:22 (1962: 57, 200, 203, 210). The common identification of this site as the birthplace of Barak (Judges 4:6), on the other hand, he deemed impossible in light of the topographic information provided and instead suggested the small site of Khibet Kedesh in the Lower Galilee (1962: 204).

A monumental temple, along with several mausolea and large stone sarcophagi, occupy a small hilltop and surrounding field east of the main tel. Several 19th-century explorers identified and investigated these remains (notably C. Conder and H. Kitto, 1881–1883: vol. 1, 226–30). In the early 1970s, Mordechai Aviam and Yuval Portugali began a systematic survey for the Israel Antiquities Authority (then the Department of Antiquities; see Aviam 1997: n. 14). In 1976 and 1977, Asher Ovadia, Moshe Fischer, and Isaac Roll resurveyed the area, concentrating especially on Roman-period remains; in the early 1980s, they conducted excavations of the temple itself (Fischer, Ovadia, and Roll 1984; 1986–1987). On the basis of inscriptions and architectural decoration, they concluded that the structure was built in the early second century C.E. and used through the third century C.E. The mausolea and sarcophagi in the adjacent field were probably contemporary. The excavators further concluded that the temple's deity ought to be identified as Baalshamin, "The Lord of Heaven," an important Syro-Phoenician god during middle and late Roman times. This identification has been disputed, and the alternative of an oracular cult to Apollo proposed (Magne 1990; Ovadia, Roll, and Fischer 1993). The most recent work in this area has been Aviam's excavations at Keren Naftali, a small fortress of late Hellenistic and early Roman date perched 400 m above the Hula Valley at the extreme eastern end of the small valley east of the mound of Kedesh itself (Aviam 1997).
On the basis of both literary and archaeological testimony, then, it can be seen that the most consistent characteristic of Kedesh is its position as a border site—at times under the Canaanites and their Phoenician successors from Tyre, at others in the hands of the Israelites and later the Maccabees. Its geographical position explains much of this—at the far eastern edge of a mountainous range that extends from immediately behind the coastal city of Tyre to the edge of the Hula basin. The site demarcates both the logical geographic limit of the Tyrian hinterland, as well as providing a gateway into, or bulwark blocking, Phoenician territory for those coming from the south and east.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN/UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA EXCAVATIONS

The current project was designed to focus on the Tyrian settlements of the Hellenistic and Roman eras (late fourth century B.C.E. through first/second centuries C.E.), although our work has now added significantly to the interpretation of the Persian period (fifth–fourth centuries B.C.E.) in the area as well. Our primary goal is to expand the understanding of Phoenician material culture as it continued and changed in interaction with that of the Greeks and Romans in the era of their political control of the region. Our larger research question is: to what extent can an ongoing Phoenician social identity be documented through the material record in the Hellenistic and Roman eras? We frame this question in light of the long-running debate about how, and even if, the material record can be validly linked to social identity in ancient times (see most recently Dieterl and Herbich 1998; Hall 1997, 1998; and Jones 1997; for Hellenistic Phoenicia in particular, see Millar 1983 and Herbert in press). It is important to keep in mind that Phoenicia as a political entity is never attested outside of Greek texts, and that Phoenicia was never a single state but instead a collection of city states that did not unite even against outside enemies (Oded 1974: 39). Nonetheless, whereas Elayi (1990: 227) points out that "specialists in Phoenician studies have not yet agreed on the identity of the Phoenicians," ancient testimony provides evidence that this term remained a valid cultural designator well into Roman times (Batty 2000).

The Phoenicians become difficult to recognize in the archaeological record precisely at the beginning of the Hellenistic period (Berlin 1997c). Just after the conquest by Alexander the Great, what had been a plethora of Phoenician material goods mysteriously vanishes, even from sites at which those goods had been most abundant (e.g., Dor). Establishing a profile of Phoenician material culture from this period has been made doubly frustrating by the clear continuation of Phoenician social, political, and economic activities (Berlin 1997b; Bikai, Fulco, and Marchand 1996; Isaac 1991; Dunand and Duru 1962). Previous excavations at the nearby site of Tel Anafa, in the Hula Valley, began to fill in a picture of Phoenician rural life, most notably with the recovery of a luxurious house with a bath complex (Herbert 1994), as well as the identification of a distinctive type of pottery marketed at sites with Phoenician populations (Berlin 1997a: 9–10, 20–29; 1997c). These initial views are valuable, but limited chronologically to after 125 B.C.E. With our work at Kedesh we hoped to test and expand this tentative profile of a Graeco-Roman Phoenician material assemblage.

The University of Michigan/University of Minnesota team has been working at Tel Kedesh since 1997. The first two seasons were short and exploratory. In 1997 we produced a topographical map of the tel (fig. 2) and established an excavation grid
loom weights, and other domestic artifacts left, apparently in primary deposit, on the Hellenistic floor (see further below, with fig. 21). The pottery dates to the first half of the second century B.C.E., suggesting that this part of the site may have been abandoned around the time of the battle between Jonathan and Demetrius (in or just after 145 B.C.E.) reported by 1 Maccabees and Josephus. Finally, midway through the 1997 season we brought in geoarchaeologist Arlene Miller Rosen as a consultant. Rosen noted the well-developed nature of the A-soil horizon, indicating, in her opinion, neither disturbance nor occupation since antiquity.

Our 1998 work at the tel consisted of one week of magnetometric survey in early March. During our short time at the site we were able to gather the magnetometric data on 62 20 × 20 m grid squares, thus completing a magnetometric map of the top of the southern tel (fig. 4). Preliminary analysis revealed the outlines of several large building complexes and what appears to be a fairly regular north-south grid plan. A particularly impressive structure showed up in the southeast quadrant of the tel, adjacent to the well-preserved remains in our 1997 probe in WB 3.1. In addition to the magnetometry we were able to extend the topographic map of the tel and its area to include much of the northern sector and surrounding areas, including the modern road and the Roman temple. It is clear from the topographical profile that, in contrast to the modern road, which approaches from the east and cuts around the north end of the tel, the ancient road most likely approached from the Hula Valley by the gentler southern slope and continued along the western side of the mound.

In summary, the results of the 1997 and 1998 exploratory seasons showed that well-preserved Hellenistic remains lay not far below the modern surface on the southern tel and that excavations there were likely to yield significant amounts of material. Based on the information gained from the topographical survey, magnetometry, and probe trenches, we planned a three-year, large-scale excavation project of which we have now completed two seasons.3

We have concentrated the majority of our work

---

2We established a grid of 12 90 × 90 m areas. These are designated W (west), C (central), or E (east), and labeled A–D from south to north. The 81 10 × 10 m squares within each area are numbered from 1.1 in the southeast to 9.9 in the northwest.

3In 1999 the University of Michigan/University of Minnesota Expedition was in the field from May 24 to July 17. Our team varied in size from 21 in May and early June to 47 in later June and July. In 2000 the expedition was in the field from May 20 to July 17. We conducted seven weeks of excavation followed by one week of study. Our team numbered 55–60, including about 40 student volunteers, graduate student supervisors, senior staff,
and specialists. We thank our excavation staff, whom we list here along with the areas that they supervised: Bjorn Anderson (CB 4.6, 2000); Nicola Arravecchia (WC 4.1, 1999; CB 1.5, 2000); Eric Bruel (CB 3.6, 2000); Elizabeth DeGrummond (CB 2.4, 1999); Brandon Foster (CB 3.8, 2000); Jennifer Gates (WB 3.1, 1999 and 2000); Adam Hyatt (CB 2.4, 2000); Karen Johnson (CB 2.7, 2000); Amanda Leins (CB 4.7, 1999 and 2000); CB 4.8, 2000); Adam Rabinowitz (CB 4.7, 1999); Adam Salisbury (CB 4.8, 1999); Andrew Wilburn (CA 9.3, 1999; CB 1.6, 2000).

around the large structure in the southeast visible in the magnetometry. This has proven to be an impressive administrative center abandoned soon after the middle of the second century b.c.e. and partially reoccupied later in that century (fig. 3, Area 1, grid squares CA 9.3 in the southeast to CB 4.8 in the northwest). We expanded our excavations around the Hellenistic house west of the administrative complex that we had first uncovered in the 1997 probe (fig. 3, Area 2, grid squares CB 3.9–WB 3.1). There we uncovered earlier and later Hellenistic occupation disturbed by considerable later pitting. We placed a trench toward the center of the south tel near the highest preserved elevation (fig. 3, Area 3, WC 4.1), where we found a Byzantine mortuary chapel. Finally, in the interest of documenting the long-term habitation of the site, we also placed a step trench on the south slope of the north tel (fig. 3, Area 4, grid square WE 3.2). There we found modern, Ottoman, Mamluk or Fatimid, Abbasid, and Middle Bronze Age occupation layers. We also made some exploratory probes in the saddle between the two parts of the tel (CD 5.8, 7.8, 8.7), where we found nothing but modern reuse. We discuss the finds from these four areas in detail below and close with some tentative conclusions about the overall history of the site.

THE AREA OF THE HELLENISTIC ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING

Overview of the Excavated Areas and Sequence of Occupation

We have cleared about 20 percent of the building. These excavations, combined with close study of the magnetometric survey, allow us to restore the building's general plan, outline its chronology, and identify certain functional areas in a preliminary way (fig. 5). The building measures 56 m east-west by 40 m
north-south. It is Hellenistic in date and built over a Persian-period predecessor. It was abandoned toward the middle of the second century B.C.E. and partially reoccupied later in that century. There are signs of early Roman robbing activities and a few scraps of Byzantine and later walls and pits in the area. From the size alone it is clear that the building must have served some kind of public function. In plan it resembles Persian and Hellenistic governors' palaces, such as those at Lachish, Dura, Nippur, and Ai Khanoum, which combined residential and administrative functions (Nielson 1999: 51–54, 115–28). The Kedesh building shares with this group a mixture of architectural layout and decorative features.

Fig. 4. Magnetometric map of southern (lower) tel.
that reflects many different influences—Greek, Macedonian, North Syrian, Babylonian, and Achaemenid. In plan and function, however, it follows eastern prototypes most closely. The Greek elements are limited to the decorative, of which the only obvious example is the stucco decoration on the walls of the bath and the room south of the archive. This is in keeping with other such structures in the east, where the Greek elements are wholly superficial in nature (Nielsen 1999:128).

We have excavated the northwest and southeast corners of the building; the northeast corner is visible on the eroded east slope of the tel. The western third of the building contains a large open court (10 × 14 m) flanked on the west and north by single rows of rooms separated from it by a wide corridor. What we interpret to be an entrance system with elaborate drainage is appearing southeast of the court. We have excavated two rooms and a section of corridor in the northwest, a piece of the courtyard in the southeast, and the drainage system to the south. The two rooms in the northwest are administrative in function; the walls of one were lined with large storage jars; the other contained over 2000 clay sealings, and was probably used as an archive. The magnetometry shows the eastern two-thirds of the building to be a dense labyrinth of rooms. We have excavated a four-room complex toward the center of this sector and part of one room to the east of what should be the northeast corner of the court. This eastern sector was most likely residential in function; a bath facility is beginning to appear in it just to the east of the court.

The interior walls of the building all exhibit the mixture of cut piers and rubble that is associated with Phoenician construction methods from the eighth century B.C.E. onward (Sharon 1987). In some cases these walls incorporate reused column drums in their makeup as well, implying the presence of a monumental predecessor to the Hellenistic phase. These interior walls average 75 cm in width and are built on slightly wider rubble foundations. The external walls of the building on the north and the south are similar in width and technique to the internal walls,
but the eastern and western external walls are quite different. They are considerably wider (about 1–1.2 m), are built entirely of rubble, and appear to have carried a mudbrick superstructure. The founding level of the north wall has been exposed and is considerably higher than a number of the internal walls, none of which bond with it. Based on these distinctions we believe that the north and south walls of the building were constructed later than the original versions of the east and west walls and some of the internal walls. These earlier walls are probably reused from the Persian version of the building.

The floors of the building likewise make use of a variety of materials, and in a number of instances the superposition of several different floor levels indicates a sequence of occupation phases from the Persian period through the Late Hellenistic. The single floor so far uncovered in the archive room consists of tamped earth and potsherds (fig. 6), except in the doorway into the north corridor, where crushed pebbles are used. The corridor itself has an upper tamped earth and sherd floor similar to that in the archive and a lower floor of crushed pebbles. The floor of the northwest storeroom is made of hard, waterproof plaster. The floor of the courtyard is made up of several layers of cobbles and crushed pebbles, as are the floors at the south entrance. Some of the rooms east of the courtyard have up to three superimposed floors of mud plaster, and the bath has a basin of waterproof plaster. Pavements of cut limestone are found abutting and in some instances bonding with the external faces of the north and south walls of the building. In terms of absolute level the upper floors vary from a maximum elevation of 465.33 m asl in the northwest storeroom to 464.08 in the eastern rooms. Overall, the floor levels are lower in the south and east than in the north and west. This is a gradual slope, however, probably reflecting the natural topography of the tel, and most likely no stairs were required to get from one room to another. The one exception is the pavement outside the southeast corner of the building, which lies 2.5 m lower than the floors of the south entrance. This discrepancy in elevation probably indicates that there was a stairway or ramp approaching up the south side of the building. Such a stepped entrance was found approaching the palace at Lachish (Nielsen 1999: 52).

In the places where we had a sequence of superimposed floors, the difference in elevation between the highest and the lowest ranged from 10 to 30 cm. We found three clearly distinguishable assemblages of pottery associated with the use of the building. The earliest of these, in which the walls of the building are founded and which represents the latest material under some of the earlier floor levels, is Persian in date. The second assemblage, which is found in and under the floors that we associate with the use of the building as an administrative center, is Hellenistic in date and contains matte red painted sherd as its latest datable material (see fig. 6). This assemblage contains no Eastern Sigillata A (ESA), a ware whose advent is now thought to take place in the third quarter of the second century B.C.E. (Slane 1997: 257–60). The third and final assemblage that we associate with the building is also Hellenistic but contains ESA. We assign this to a later second century B.C.E. reoccupation of the building after its demise as a single integrated structure. The evidence of the coins and the stamped amphora handles supports this interpretation of the occupation sequence (tables 1 and 2).

The Northern Sections of the Hellenistic Administrative Building

The NW Archive Room (CB 4.7/4.8). The archive room lies at the northwest corner of the large

---

4We base these generalizations on observation of the north and west walls, which are better preserved and have been much more extensively exposed than those on the south and east.
building. It measures 5.4 m north-south by 6 m east-west. A door in its southern wall leads into a corridor to the south. The walls are preserved to a height of 0.5–1.2 m and appear just below topsoil except at the internal corners, where they were robbed to foundation level by builders of the early Roman era. There was a single floor at a level of 465.00–465.05 m asl (locus CB 48026), made largely of tamped earth and thousands of small sherds of matte red painted ware (fig. 6). Patches of pebble flooring appeared near and in the southern doorway. The floor was soft and recognizable during excavation only by the layer of ash, whole vessels, and sealings immediately above (loci CB 47016, 47017, 48024, 48025). Sealings were found scattered throughout the room but largely concentrated in the north.

Nearly 100 kg of pottery were recovered from the undisturbed deposits in and immediately above the floor of the room. The heaviest concentration of intact pots was uncovered along the south wall running east from the doorway into the southeastern corner of the room. A total of 52 vessels, many intact or fully restorable, were crammed into that area, sometimes lying two to three deep. The assemblage includes 40 small amphoriskoi of Phoenician semi-fine fabric (fig. 7; Berlin 1997a: 54–57, pl. 11), two much larger amphoriskoi, also of semi-fine, four short-stemmed and two elongated fusiform unguentaria, all of Phoenician semi-fine (Berlin 1997a: 62, 65–66, pls. 13–14), one small semi-fine unguentarium (fig. 8:6), and three probably imported unguentaria (two illustrated in fig. 8:4–5). A complete semi-fine lagynos (fig. 8:3) was found in the northwestern corner of the room. Two restorable black-slip plates, one probably of eastern Mediterranean manufacture (fig. 8:1) and the second likely a product of the Italian

### Table 1. Conspectus of Coins Found at Kedesh, 1997-2000 Excavation Seasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minting authority</th>
<th>Alexandria</th>
<th>Akko-Ptolemais</th>
<th>Palestine</th>
<th>Tyre</th>
<th>Damascus</th>
<th>Antioch</th>
<th>Paphos</th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th>Constantinople</th>
<th>Unidentified</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy IX/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomus Akko-Ptolemais (before 132 B.C.E.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius II (2nd reign, 129–125 B.C.E.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII (125–121 B.C.E.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleucid (2nd century B.C.E.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st century B.C.E.–1st century C.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valens (364–375 C.E.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364–375 C.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Nasir Muhammad (1310–1341 C.E.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Hamid II (1876 C.E.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Mandate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. List of Rhodian Stamped Amphora Handles Found at Kedesh, 1997–2000 Seasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory no.</th>
<th>Approx. date (B.C.E.)</th>
<th>Shape of stamp</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Pottery no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99-1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Τιμοκλῆς(ως) / Δα(λίου)</td>
<td>Τιμοκλῆς 1st Ep.</td>
<td>WE32011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-2</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Αρετᾶκλέους</td>
<td>Αρετᾶκλέους Ep.</td>
<td>WB31024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-3</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Τιμοδίκου/Σμυνθίου</td>
<td>Τιμοδίκου Ep.</td>
<td>CB47011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-4</td>
<td>152–141</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Καλλάνος Above, herm ←</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>WB31024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-5</td>
<td>166–108</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Τιμώς</td>
<td>Τιμώ (2nd?) Fab.</td>
<td>CB47020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-6</td>
<td>159–158</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Τιμωρρόδου/Ἀρταμάτιου</td>
<td>Τιμωρρόδου Ep.</td>
<td>CB47010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-7</td>
<td>189–145</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἰπποκ[ράτε]ς</td>
<td>Ἰπποκράτης Fab.</td>
<td>CB47011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-8</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Βρομίου wreath</td>
<td>Βρόμιος Fab.</td>
<td>CB47019 P 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-9</td>
<td>150–146</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Μάντινος</td>
<td>Μάντιν Fab.</td>
<td>CB47000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-10</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Ξενοφάντου/Σμυνθίου</td>
<td>Ξενόφαντος 2nd Ep.</td>
<td>CB47010 P 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ[- -]τυχ[- -]θεσμοφορίου</td>
<td>Illegible</td>
<td>CB48020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-2</td>
<td>154/3–127</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Δι[ξοκ]νείας</td>
<td>Διοκλείας Fab.</td>
<td>CB56002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Cornucopia Ιεράκου Below, double axe</td>
<td>Ιερᾶς Fab.</td>
<td>CB27011 P 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-4</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Ξενοφάντου/Πανάμου</td>
<td>Ξενόφαντος 2nd Ep.</td>
<td>CB27011 P 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Αγο[- -]/Πανάμου</td>
<td>Αγο Fab.</td>
<td>CB56008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-6</td>
<td>170/168</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Α[θανάδοςτο] Δα[κλίου</td>
<td>Αθανάδοςτο Ep.</td>
<td>CB27012 P 125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-7</td>
<td>152–141</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Κάλλον(ος) Above, herm ←</td>
<td>Κάλλον Fab.</td>
<td>CB27010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-8</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Ανδρο/νείκου/Ἀραμάμιτιου</td>
<td>Ανδρόμεικος Ep.</td>
<td>CB27013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-9</td>
<td>129–123</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ρόδω[νος] Above, herm ←</td>
<td>Ρόδων 2nd Fab.</td>
<td>CB27012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-10</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Μάνις</td>
<td>Μάνι Fab.</td>
<td>CB48025 P 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-11</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Α[θ]ικράτε/ς Αρταμαίτιου σταρ</td>
<td>Αὐτοκράτης 2nd Ep.</td>
<td>CB48025 P 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-12</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἡλιόν head Ἐπὶ Πρα[τοφάνε]ς</td>
<td>Πρατοφάνης Ep.</td>
<td>CB27013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-13</td>
<td>198–146+</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἡρα[κλείτου] stars in corners</td>
<td>Ἡρακλείτου Fab.</td>
<td>CB48025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-14</td>
<td>174/172</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Κλευκρά-τε/ς/Ἀγρι[αν]ή</td>
<td>Κλευκράτης 1st Ep.</td>
<td>CB16002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-15</td>
<td>179/177</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Αἰνίταδιμο/Πανάμου</td>
<td>Αἰνίταδιμος 2nd Ep.</td>
<td>CB16002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-16</td>
<td>170/168</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Δαμοκράτε/ς sec. stamp: A</td>
<td>Δαμοκράτης 1st Fab.</td>
<td>CB27011 P 125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>[- -]</td>
<td>Illegible</td>
<td>CB24035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-18</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Α[θ]ικράτε/ς/Καινείου</td>
<td>Αὐτοκράτης 2nd Ep.</td>
<td>CB38011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ Ἀρτ [- -]/θεσμοφορίου</td>
<td>Illegible</td>
<td>CB48026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ἐπὶ [- -]Ι/[- -]Ι/Ἀγρι[αν]ή</td>
<td>Illegible</td>
<td>CB38017 P 201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>[- -]α</td>
<td>Illegible</td>
<td>CB38017 P 201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Identical pottery numbers indicate connected handles.

The manufacture at Cales (fig. 8:2; Woolley 1911; Morel 1983), were found together with a deer antler in a heap of ash on the floor midway along the wall. In the disturbed debris above the floor we found an imported West-slope-style table amphora and lid, both of probable Pergamene manufacture (K00 P114, 231; Schäfer 1968: D70, Taf. 17–18), one complete lug-handled mold-made lamp (fig. 8.7), a complete extended rim mortarium made of spatter-painted ware (fig. 8:8; Berlin 1997a: 129, PW 361, 362, pl. 39), a small casserole with ledge rim and a matching lid, both made of the sandy cooking ware typical of the Akko region (K00 P220, 206; Berlin 1997a: 12; A. Shapiro, personal communication), a complete incurved rim bowl with a matte red slip, probably manufactured on the central coast (K00 P191; A. Shapiro, personal communication), and one restorable and one partially preserved Rhodian amphora (K00 SAH 10 and 11, K00 SAH 13). The restorable jar’s stamped handles provide a date of 146 B.C.E.; the second jar dates between 180 and 145 B.C.E. These dates are wholly consistent with the entire ceramic assemblage, all of which fits comfortably in the first half of the second century B.C.E.
Most telling, there is not a single piece of Eastern Sigillata A, though there did appear a few fragments of a black-slipped ware that Slane identified as the immediate predecessor of ESA (Slane 1997: 269–71).

The datable sealings reinforce the evidence of the ceramics. There are 22 Seleucid royal portraits thus far identified, ranging from Antiochus II through Demetrius I. There are several inscribed pieces that bear dates, ranging from 167 B.C.E. (see Ariel and Naveh in this issue, no. 6) to 148 B.C.E. (from the corridor; see Ariel and Naveh in this issue, no. 3). All of this leads to the conclusion that the archive went out of use very close to the time of Demetrius III's loss to the Maccabees in or just after 145 B.C.E.

The deposits above the floor in the archive room are mixed. In a number of places early Roman robbing pits penetrate to the floor and in some instances below it. The Roman-era activity is documented by fragments of first-century C.E. cooking wares from the Kfar Hananya pottery (loci CB 48027, 47011–13; Adan-Bayewitz 1993). Where the Hellenistic deposits are undisturbed we have clear evidence of destruction by fire and wall and roof collapse. A layer of largely intact burned mud-bricks, fallen from the western wall, overlay a mixture of decayed brick and rubble (locus CB 48021/22). This layer contained 22 complete or nearly complete iron roofing spikes (fig. 9). The date of this collapse is not completely clear. The debris does contain ESA, pointing to a date later than the archive and possibly contemporary with the later second-century B.C.E. reoccupation seen elsewhere in the building.

There are several curious features about the later history of the archive room. This is the only area excavated so far that shows evidence of destruction by fire; the door into the corridor seems to have been intentionally blocked before the fire (fig. 10); and most surprising, there are two infant burials in the room. These were placed directly above the floor deposit and originally covered by the burned brick and roof fall.

The burials were found in the north half of the room. One (CB 48018) was disturbed by the early Roman building activity, but the other (CB 48019) was sealed beneath the burned brick layer (fig. 11). This burial was built against the north wall of the room and was surrounded by small stones, but was not itself covered by stone. The skeleton was oriented with its head to the west. The hands and feet were missing and appear to have been amputated before interment. There were no grave goods with this burial, but a number of carnelian and glass beads scattered around the disturbed burial may have been part of the original deposit. Child sacrifice in times of danger is known to have taken place both in Carthage and in Phoenician-dominated Cyprus, at the site of Idalion (S. Brown 1991; Cross 1994; Morris 1995: 234–36 and nn. 32–34; see also O'Bryhim 2001). It is possible that we have evidence for such a practice here. Another possibility, though, is that the burials took place at the time of resettlement and, together with the fire, were part of some kind of founding or purification ritual.5

---

5The only mention of amputation similar to that which we discovered occurs in 2 Sam 4:12, in which David has the hands
**The Corridor (CB 3.8, NE Quadrant).** The door in the south wall of the archive room leads into a corridor approximately 3 m wide from north to south which dead-ends into the west wall of the building. The south wall of the corridor is broken by a wide doorway on axis with that in the north wall. This leads into another room to the south. We left the southern room unexcavated, but we can see that the inner face of its north wall is stuccoed. Unlike the archive room, the corridor shows signs of several phases of occupation. The first is marked by a

and feet of the murderers of Ish-bosheth cut off. We thank William Malandra for alerting us to this reference.
floor of crushed pebbles, plaster, and pavers at an elevation of 464.70–464.75 m asl (loci CB 38022–24). This earlier floor was exposed only in patches within the room on the last day of excavation, and more may remain to be uncovered. We found material dating to the Hellenistic era down to the floor, but since we have not excavated beneath it we cannot say whether it is Hellenistic or earlier in date. The floor was best preserved in the doorways and running out from them; it did not run up to the west wall of the building; instead an irregular pile of rubble that appears to be the foundation layer of the wall projects some 75 cm east of the wall. The second floor (locus CB 38018) was similar in composition to the tamped earth and sherd floor in the archive room and lay at roughly the same elevation (465.00–465.05 m asl). The floor was difficult to distinguish from the fill above it. This consisted of ashy brown soil rich in artifacts about 40 cm deep (locus CB 38017). This deposit differed in two ways from the floor deposit in the archive room. It did not have the same bright red burnished brick color, and the density of artifacts was considerably lower. It did yield a complete Rhodian amphora with stamps that date to the second century B.C.E. (K00 SAH 20, 21), two coins dated to the third/second centuries B.C.E. (K00 C55, 56), a complete imported black-slipped jug (K00 P211), and 91 sealings. The sealings and the jug were all found in the west third of the room up against the west wall directly over the rubble projecting from that wall. An intact storage jar of local manufacture (K00 P184) stood in this floor deposit and was embedded in the east balk of the trench. When we removed the jar we found that it was leaning against a cross wall that abutted the south wall of the corridor. Because this wall blocked...
the corridor and was founded above the floor deposit, we assign it to the later Hellenistic reoccupation of the site.

The post-building fill (locus CB 38016) within the corridor was a mixture of soft brown earth and broken brick about 40 cm deep. There were none of the solid masses of burned brick that characterized the debris above the floor deposit in the archive room. The latest datable material in this fill was late first century B.C.E./first century C.E. This was succeeded by a subsoil (locus CB 38011) containing pottery of the fourth through sixth centuries C.E. that covered the walls of the building.

**The NW Storeroom.** To the east of the archive and north of the corridor we have uncovered a room that contained 15 large storage jars, 2 Rhodian amphoras, and assorted other pottery (fig. 12). The east, west, and north walls of the room have been exposed in their entirety; the south wall must lie just inside the north balk in line with the south wall of the archive room and the north wall of the corridor. The room measures 4.9 m east-west by 5.4 m north-south. There are no doors in the west, north,
or east walls, so access must have come from the south. The storage jars were found leaning against the south, west, and north walls of the room with their bottoms resting on the floor. That floor was a hard waterproof plaster (CB 47006) and sloped from a high point of 465.33 m asl in the northeast to 465.20 in the southeast. A circular pit lined with the same plaster as the floor and finished with a carefully beveled rim is situated midway along the east wall. This plastered installation's diameter is about 20 cm wider than that of the large jars, and its depth is about half their height. We can imagine two possible functions for this installation: (1) as a settling or collecting basin for the goods that were stored inside the jars (on which see further below), or (2) as a secure spot into which a jar could be positioned for filling and/or emptying.

The storage jars found in this room are quite large, standing about 1.6 m tall and with a maximum diameter of about 60 cm (fig. 13). All are made of the same fabric, which is dark red-brown in color and heavily tempered with white grits of all sizes, giving a coarse look and feel. Despite being of an identical fabric, no two vessels are the same in profile—though all share the same general characteristics: a slightly bulging, abraded toe, straight walls, a short sloping shoulder with two very broad, ridged strap handles positioned just below, and a thickened rim. Petrographic analysis of this fabric has shown it to be derived from formations in north-central or northeastern Galilee, which is to say the region around the site itself (A. Shapiro, personal communication). This fabric, which we have termed Red-Brown Gritty (RBG), seems to be a close relative of another fabric of Galilean manufacture recently recognized, which has been termed Galilean Coarse Ware (Frankel et al. 2001: 61–62). These various clues—the jars' local fabric, their enormous capacity, and their individual profiles—indicate that they were made in this area for use at the site itself, and probably manufactured one at a time, as needed. Residue analysis of two jar bottoms indicates that they held grain, specifically *Triticum aestivum*, or bread wheat (Berlin et al. 2003). Thus this room apparently functioned as a granary, with stored wheat collected as taxation in kind and/or held for...
distribution. We found three nonlocal storage jars in this room: one baggy jar of Phoenician semi-fine ware (Berlin 1997a: 155–56, pls. 57, 88) and two Rhodian amphoras, one lying on the floor in the northeastern part of the room and the other in the northwest (K99 P52 with K99 SAH 8 and 10, K99 SAH 3). Finally, there was a complete Phoenician semi-fine jug on the floor just south of the plastered installation (K99 P13; Berlin 1997a: 48–49, pls. 8, 74) and large fragments of two Campana A plates at the bottom of the pit (K99 P60, 61).

The intact condition of the jars points toward a rapid abandonment of the building in which significant amounts of provisions were left behind. The most closely datable items in the deposit are the two Rhodian amphoras, one with both stamped handles preserved and the second with its epoynm stamp. The first amphora dates to 151 B.C.E., while the second dates to 145 B.C.E. The terminus post quem for the room's abandonment is therefore 145 B.C.E.

There are no signs that this room was reoccupied by the later Hellenistic settlers. The walls were robbed at the southwest, northwest, and northeast corners, and the latest material in these robbing trenches (loci CB 47010, 47011, 47019) were cooking pots of Kfar Hananya manufacture dating from 50 B.C.E. through the mid-second century C.E. (Adan-Bayewitz 1993: 124–25, type 4A). The mixed fills that penetrated all the way to the Hellenistic floor and to the bottom of the settling basin contained similarly datable material. Some later Byzantine-era pits were also found over the room, and the topsoil yielded Ottoman-era pottery and modern coins as late as C.E. 1939 (table 1).

**The North Storeroom (?) (CB 4.6, SE Quadrant).** Some 8 m east of the NW Storeroom we discovered a narrow room (3 m east-west) built against the north wall of the building. The north, west, and east walls of the room lay within the excavated area. All had been extensively robbed, apparently in the early Roman era (locus CB 46010/011). All that remained of the north wall (locus CB 46003) was a wide boulder foundation course. The west (locus CB 46001) and east (locus CB 46002) walls fared somewhat better, with pier and rubble superstructure preserved as much as 1.5 m high in some places but robbed to the foundations in others. We exposed the founding levels of the north and west walls at elevations of 464.13 and 463.80 m asl, respectively. We had not reached the foundation of the east wall when excavation stopped at 463.50. The walls do not bond with one another. The deeper founding levels of the east and west walls may indicate that they originally belonged to an earlier structure, reused at the time of the construction of the Hellenistic building.

A limestone pavement was uncovered outside the building to the north at an elevation of 464.90 m asl (CB 46004/05). It is bonded in places with the foundation of the north wall and appears to have been constructed at the same time as that wall. The latest


datable material in the sealed fill below the pavement (CB 46005.1) was fragments of saucers of the same matte red painted ware as that comprising the sherded floor of the NW Archive room and the Corridor (fig. 6). A similar situation occurs beneath the paving found at the southeastern corner of the Hellenistic Administrative Building (see below, CA 9.3). The deep wall robbing pits destroyed all interior floors of the room. Fragments of four restorable store jars identical to those found in theNW Storeroom (K00 P105, 127, 128, 129) and a large store jar of spatter-painted ware (K00 P130) were found in these disturbed fills, leading us to hypothesize that this area was used for grain storage during the Hellenistic occupation. Two isolated patches of plaster flooring were preserved in the south of the trench; the higher ( locus CB 46006) lay at an elevation of 464.14 m asl, the lower ( locus CB 46007) at 463.98. Two mid-second-century B.C.E. coins (K00 C54, 59) and small amounts of second-century B.C.E. plain wares were found in the lowest fills against the walls (locus CB 46016/017), but most of the material from these fills was Persian or earlier in date. In the absence of sealed deposits and the deep robbing of the walls, it is unclear whether the later finds come from disturbances.

The Courtyard of the Hellenistic Administrative Building (CB 2.7)

In the south half of trench CB 2.7 we uncovered the southwest corner of the courtyard of the Hellenistic Administrative Building along with an expanse of courtyard floor extending 5 m to the north and 7 m to the east. We estimate the overall dimensions of the court to be roughly 14 m north-south by 10 m east-west. This assumes that the south wall of the north corridor forms the north border of the court, and the west wall of the bath complex—on which see further below—forms the east wall; if there is a corridor along the east side of the court, the east-west dimension would be less. The west wall of the court ( locus CB 27001) serves as the east wall of one of the western rooms of the building. Little can be said about this room since we did not excavate to the floor level, and given the small area excavated it could be a corridor rather than a room. It does have a door entering the court. The west and south walls of the court are built of pier and rubble construction. The walls began to appear 30 cm below the modern surface and the floors at a depth of 1 m. We did not reach the founding level of either wall.

The flooring of the court was made up of crushed limestone, pebbles, and cobbles. There were a number of resurfacings, and at least three distinct phases can be distinguished. The earliest floor ( locus CB 27016) lies at an elevation of 464.50 m asl and was uncovered in a small probe in the southeast corner of the trench. The latest datable material in and under this floor was local pottery with parallels from Persian-period strata (fifth–fourth centuries B.C.E.) in the region. The second floor ( locus CB 27008) lay over this at 464.76–464.62 m asl and was separated from it by a layer of fill. Neither the floor nor the fill contained material later than Persian. It should be noted that the probe in which these floors were excavated was small (1.5 × 1.5 m) and the material recovered scanty (10 kg of pottery in total). It is possible that when the entire court is excavated, Hellenistic material will be recovered under at least the later floor. There are patches on that floor ( locus CB 27015) that do contain Hellenistic material (third–early second century B.C.E.). These patches run through the doorway into the room west of the court. The latest floor in the courtyard ( locus CB 27007) was restricted to the southwest corner, where a small room was built during a later phase of the building (see below).

A small room was constructed in the southwest corner of the court; this measured 2.5 m north-south by 2 m east-west. The walls of the court served as its south and west walls, and new walls built entirely of rubble formed its east and north boundaries (loci CB 27005 and 27006). These walls were built entirely of rubble and were founded in the latest courtyard floor at an elevation of 464.95–464.88 m asl. The fill under these walls and in and under the floor in the room contained Hellenistic pottery including Phoenician semi-fine but no ESA. A good deal of restorable pottery was found inside this room, including an entire array of vessels necessary for cooking and entertaining. Fine table wares include one BSP plate (fig. 14:1; Slane 1997: 276, TA type 2, pls. 2, 37) and one BSP bowl (fig. 14:2; Slane 1997: 279–80, TA type 6, pls. 3, 38), both Phoenician products.7 Service vessels, all made of Phoe-

---

7Kathleen Slane has defined BSP as the Black-Slipped Predecessor to ESA. Chemical analysis has shown that this ware shares the same fabric as ESA, but the exterior slip is black instead of red. For a full discussion see Slane 1997: 269–74.
Fig. 14. Middle Hellenistic pottery from the courtyard of the Hellenistic Administrative Building.

nician semi-fine, include a table jug identical to that found on the floor of the NW Storeroom (fig. 14:3; Berlin 1997a: 48–49, pls. 8, 74), a wide-mouthed juglet (fig. 14:5; Berlin 1997a: 52–53, pls. 10, 74), and an unusually large and finely finished amphoriskos (fig. 14:4). There were two partially preserved cooking vessels, both of Akko sandy cooking ware (Berlin 1997a: 12; A. Shapiro, personal communication): a cooking pot with short neck and flattened rim (fig. 14:6; Berlin 1997a: 89, pls. 22, 78), and a casserole with rounded body and broad angled ledge rim (fig. 14:7; Berlin 1997a: 98, PW 240). There was also a largely intact lug-handled mold-made lamp (fig. 14:8) and an entire Rhodian amphora (K00 P37 with K00 SAH 3, 4) dating to 151 B.C.E., just like one of the amphoras in the NW Storeroom.

It is unclear whether this small room was built during the building’s use as an administration building/gubernatorial residence or by the later Hellenistic resettlers. The absence of later Hellenistic material from the assemblage in the room would suggest the former. It is common for the public entertainment rooms, or androns, to be located next to the court in such public buildings (Nielsen 1999: 21–23, 53, 116, 119). The small room might have been used as a pantry for the pottery needed for entertainment in rooms to the west. The fact that the one room we have begun to uncover along the west side (i.e., the unexcavated room to the south of the northwest corridor) carried stucco decoration on its walls would argue for such a ceremonial use of the western suite of rooms.

The latest courtyard floor was covered with a thin layer of fine brown soil (CB 27017) in which the latest datable material was a single fragment of ESA. A dense rubble fill with a high concentration of pottery (locus CB 27013) filled the area of the court above the brown soil and in some instances penetrated to the court floor. The latest material in this rubble is early Roman, including a piece of blown glass. Above this were disturbed rubble layers and subsoil (loclip CB 27010–12 and 27020) in which the latest datable material ranged from late Roman to modern. With the exception of a small circular structure of fourth century C.E. or later date in the
northwest of the excavated area, there were no architectural remains in the area later than Hellenistic.

**The Eastern Sections of the Hellenistic Administrative Building**

**The SE Corner (CA 9.3, Western Quadrants).** We uncovered the southeast corner of the Hellenistic Administrative Building in the southwest quadrant of trench CA 9.3. As in the northwest, the corner was constructed from massive rough-cut limestone boulders (80 cm–1 m in length) that bonded. Only a small section of the south wall (locus CA 93004) lay in the area excavated, but a 6-m length of the east wall (locus CA 93002/003) was uncovered. This proved to have a complex history in which it appears to have been robbed on two separate occasions. The first phase of the wall (locus CA 93002) appears to have been originally built in the Persian period and deeply robbed at the time of the construction of the Hellenistic building. What remains along most of the exposed length is a rubble foundation 1.2 m wide at a depth of 461.80/461.90 m asl. The robbing trench (locus CA 93018) contains Hellenistic plain wares as the latest datable material and cuts through fills (locus CA 93019/020) against the wall line in which the latest material dates to the Persian period. At the corner of the Hellenistic Administrative Building the wall is preserved higher and the Hellenistic wall (locus CA 93003) is founded directly upon it. What remains of the Hellenistic wall is 85 cm in width and constructed of cut boulders rather than rubble. This was in turn robbed, and the latest datable material from that robbing trench (locus CA 93011) is an ESA platter dating to the first century B.C.E. (Hayes 1985: form 4a, tav. I.9). This robbing episode destroyed all of the Hellenistic floors inside the building in the area excavated. To the south of the building, however, we did uncover a pavement (locus CA 93005) that lies at an elevation of 462.13 m asl and appears to be contemporary with the building. One further feature of the Hellenistic building is visible in this area: a pier and rubble wall visible in the north balk of the trench (locus CA 93001) parallel to the south wall and 6 m to its north. This must form the north wall of a southeast corner room.

**The Eastern Complex of Rooms (CB 2.4) (fig. 15).** We have excavated the greater part of four contiguous rooms in the east central sector about 15 m east of the courtyard and 20 m northwest of the southeast corner of the Hellenistic Administrative Building. Occupation in the area is attested from the Hellenistic through Byzantine eras. The rooms themselves were most likely built in the early Hellenistic era, remodeled in the late second century B.C.E., and reused in the Roman era. Deep pits in three of the rooms date to the early Roman period, and at least one of the Hellenistic walls was robbed to foundation level in the Byzantine era.

It is in the northwest room of the group that we recovered the best-preserved sequence of occupation. We exposed the south and east walls of this room and excavated them to below their founding levels; the line of the north wall can be traced in a robbing trench along the north balk. The west wall lies outside the excavated area. The room is large, measuring just under 5 m north-south and over 5 m east-west. The preserved walls stand almost 2 m in height and first appear in topsoil with some stones visible at the modern surface. Both walls were built of pier and rubble and had a number of large column drums from an earlier structure incorporated into them (see below, fig. 17). They were founded at an elevation of 462.80–462.90 m asl in a half-meter-deep pottery-rich fill in which the latest datable material was Persian (loci CB 24049–51). This layer yielded nearly 1100 kg of nonrestorable pottery and appears to be a fill brought in for the construction of the walls. The southern wall (locus CB 24010) was robbed and rebuilt in the late second century B.C.E. (locus CB 24009). This later version was in turn robbed along much of its length in the Byzantine era. The later section of wall was constructed solely of rubble, and the latest datable material in the fill beneath it (locus CB 24009.1) was ESA.

We found a series of three superimposed floors running up to the south wall. The lowest (locus CB 24037/38) was made up of earth and plaster; it lay at an elevation of 463.80 m asl and was associated with the earlier, pier and rubble, phase of the wall. Fill beneath the floor contained fragments of a Hellenistic painted lagynos, dating the floor firmly to the Hellenistic era. The second floor (locus CB 24034) was also a mix of plaster and dirt; it fell at an

---

8 This 1100 kg of pottery contained two fragments of later material, which we attribute to contamination from the deep early Roman pit in the room. These are a piece of Cypriot sigillata and one fragment of ESA in loci CB 24049 and 24050, respectively.
Elevation of 464.00 m asl and ran up against the later, rubble, phase of the south wall. The latest datable material from the fill beneath this floor was a piece of an imported, later second-century B.C.E. Pompeian red ware pan. The latest floor (locus CB 24008) lay at an elevation of 464.08 m asl. It too ran up to the later phase of the south wall. The sealed fill below (locus CB 24008.1) contained ESA, dating this floor to at least the later second century B.C.E. A large pit (locus CB 24035) in the center of the room cut through all three floor layers and deep into the early fill. This pit was full of what appears to be detritus from the demolition of the large building—many pieces of painted stucco and rubble from the walls. The pit also yielded a considerable amount of late Hellenistic pottery of wares and shapes unattested in the main use phases of the Hellenistic Administrative Building. We associate this material with the reoccupation of the site in the later second century B.C.E. The pottery included pieces of a black-slipped fish plate of Egyptian terra nigra (fig. 16:5; see Berlin 2001: 29, fig. 2.4.8–15) and an ESA hemispherical bowl (K00 P237; Slane 1997: 317, TA type 27b, pl. 21); joining fragments of both these vessels came also from a pit in the northeastern room (see below). This pit also contained a restorable, and quite large, ESA fish plate (K00 P187; Slane 1997: 283, TA type 11, pl. 5), a deep casserole with caricatured body and angled rim, whose shape mirrors a type produced at the early Roman manufacture at Kfar Hananya but whose fabric is identical to that of the contemporary Golan-area manufacturies (K00 P164; Adan-Bayewitz 1993: 176, G3A), and a globular cooking pot with thin walls and a high, convex neck, closely reminiscent of vessels found in the first-century B.C.E. levels at Gamla (K00 P169; Díez
Fernández 1983: 152, T 10.2).9 Eleven coins were recovered from the pit; ten of these date to the third quarter of the second century B.C.E. and one from the fourth quarter. The latest item from the pit is a fragment of an early Roman lamp.

We excavated a small strip of the southwest room of this complex along wall CB 24009/10. A sequence of three plaster and earth floors similar to those in the northwest room was found here. The highest of the floors in the room (locus CB 24044) lay at an elevation of 464.04 m asl; the second (CB 24045) consisted of several lamina of plaster at an elevation of 463.90–463.80; the third (CB 24047, 24048) appeared in patches at 463.61. As in the northwest room, the lowest floor was associated with the original phase of wall CB 24010 and the upper two with the rebuilt phase of that wall. The latest material sealed under any of these floors was sherds of the same matte red painted ware that formed the floor of the NW Archive room (fig. 6).

The northeast room of the complex measures 5 m north-south by 5 m east-west. We did not excavate deeply here but did expose the south, west, and north walls and excavated a pit (locus CB 24033) in the center of the room. The east wall can be seen at the surface just to the east of the excavated area. The west wall (locus CB 24007) divides this room from the northwest room and has been described above (fig. 17). The south wall, which we have excavated on the south face to its founding level at 462.70 m asl, has an upper rubble phase (locus CB 24004) and a lower pier, rubble, and reused column phase (locus CB 24005). We removed the upper phase of the wall and found ESA sealed beneath it. Only the top course of the north wall has been exposed, and that is made of rubble (locus CB 24006). We stopped excavating the interior of the room at an elevation of 463.30 m asl and encountered no floors. It is not clear whether the floors lay at levels comparable to those in the western rooms and have thus disappeared due to erosion, or whether they lie at lower, as yet unexcavated, levels. We excavated the pit in the center to a meter and a half in depth but are not sure we have reached the bottom. The assemblage in this pit (locus CB 24033) was very similar to that from the pit in the northwest room (locus CB 24035) and in fact included joining fragments of the Egyptian terra nigra fish plate found there (fig. 16:5). There was considerably more pottery in this pit (332 kg as compared with 41 kg), including a complete incurved rim bowl of Cypriot Sigillata (fig. 16:4; K00 P41; Hayes 1985: 84, form P20, tav. 19.12), and a cooking pot and casserole of Akko sandy cooking ware (K00 P168: see Berlin 1997a: 88, PW 184–86, pl. 21; K00 P39: see Berlin 1997a: 98, PW 234, pl. 28), both restorable, along with large pieces of painted stucco and rubble. The pit in the southeast room yielded 13 coins, all but 2 of

---

9 Berlin has analyzed all of the Hellenistic and early Roman-period pottery excavated at Gamla and is preparing this material for publication.
which dated to the third quarter of the second century B.C.E. With the exception of a single Byzantine coin (K00 C14), which we attribute to contamination, the latest material from the pit may be dated to the first century B.C.E.

The southeast room of the complex is small, measuring 2.4 m north-south by 3.5 m east-west. We have exposed all four walls of the room and excavated them below founding level. As described above, the north wall of the room (locus CB 24004/05) has two phases, the lower of which is constructed of pier and rubble and founded at 462.71 m asl. The west and south walls (locus CB 24015) are built of pier and rubble and reused column drums (fig. 17). The west wall (locus CB 24001) is founded at 462.99 and the south at 463.08 m asl. The east wall (locus CB24016) is constructed of large cut boulders; it is founded at 463.11 m asl. No floors were preserved in this room, and we found early Roman materials in the fills down to the founding levels of the south and east walls. These gave way to fills in which the latest material was Hellenistic (loci CB 24017–20), including Phoenician semi-fine and imported wheel-made lamps; at elevation 462.60 we stopped excavating.

**East of the Courtyard (CB 3.6, SE Quadrant)** (fig. 18). We excavated a 5 × 5 m area east of what should be the northeastern corner of the court and uncovered two architectural phases of Hellenistic occupation. The earlier of these consisted of a single room, the west wall of which (locus CB 36018) probably marks the east side of the court. This wall is decorated on its internal face with painted stucco imitating masonry (fig. 19). No other external walls of the room fell into the excavated quadrant, so it must have measured at least 5 m north-south by 4 m east-west. A narrow east-west wall (locus CB 36020) began about 50 cm south of the west wall. This wall was plastered on both faces. This, and its narrow width, lead us to identify it as a half wall or bench rather than a supporting wall. The bench was separated from the west wall of the room by a piece of waterproof flooring (locus CB 36019/21) that ran

![Fig. 17. West wall of NE room (CB 24007) showing two construction phases.](image-url)
Fig. 18. Bath (CB 3.6), plan with both phases.

from its north face about 1 m south into the south balk. The bench ran at an angle into the south balk of the trench. It was only when we trimmed the balk that we could see that the flooring ran all along the south face of the bench and into the balk, forming the floor of a large basin with an outlet into the northern part of the room. The plaster floor lay at elevation of 464.50 m asl where it met the west wall, and this coincided with the bottom of the decorated stucco. It sloped down gradually to the east. No floor was preserved to the north of the bench, where we have excavated down to an elevation of 463.90. The features so far exposed in the room—basin, bench, and stuccoed wall—bear a remarkable resemblance to the middle room of the Hellenistic bath excavated at Tel Anafa (Herbert 1994: 62–72). Likewise the placement of the complex to the east of the court mirrors that at Tel Anafa. These close similarities lead us to believe that we have discovered a bath complex similar to that at Tel Anafa.10

The central room of the bath at Anafa had a mosaic floor north of the basin, and it is possible that such a floor was removed by later builders at Kedesh; a large number of tesserae were found in an

10It is interesting to note that one of the Zenon papyri attests to his having enjoyed a bath at Kedesh when he visited in 259 B.C.E. (Westermann, Keyes, and Liebesny 1940: no. 61).
early Roman dump some 20 m north of this area just outside the building (see below, CB 5.6). We have left all of the walls and floors of the bath in place, wanting to explore the basin farther to the south in future seasons. Due to the absence of a floor in the northern area, where we did excavate deeply, we have no sealed deposits by which to date the room. We did encounter a layer of pottery and bone-rich debris at about 25 cm deep (locus CB 36013) in this area. The latest material recovered in this layer is consistent with a mid-second-century B.C.E. date. It overlay another pottery- and bone-laden stratum some 15 cm deep in which the latest material was Persian in date (locus CB 36014). We stopped excavation at this point. We have not reached the founding level of any of the walls associated with the bath, so it may have had several use phases.

The latest use of the room appears to have taken place in the late second and early first centuries B.C.E. At this time a wall was built parallel to and 3 m east of the stuccoed wall. This new wall (locus CB 36010/22) was built of ashlar blocks and reused column drums placed vertically. The wall was connected to the stuccoed wall by an east-west rubble wall (locus CB 36011/23). A tabun (locus CB 36009/24) was placed to the south of this room just east of the stuccoed wall. No floors were recovered in association with these structures, but cooking wares from the fills in and under the walls and under the tabun indicate a first-century B.C.E. date for their construction (loci CB 36009.1–36011).11 The walls were founded at elevations varying from 454.50 to 464.40 m asl and the tabun at 465.70. All appear to have been in use with the stuccoed wall. At some point in the later history of the tel, another wall was built over the stuccoed wall running at a slightly

11Locus CB 36012 yielded one fragment of ESA and a store jar similar to those found in first-century B.C.E. contexts at Gamla, but neither of these were sealed beneath the walls or tabun.
more westerly angle (locus CB 36017). We left this wall in place and recovered no associated material by which to date it.

**The SE Probe (CB 1.5, SE Quadrant).** We put a single 5 × 5 m probe down in the southeast of the Hellenistic Administrative Building, about 10 m east of where we would expect the southeast corner of the court and 8 m south of the east complex of rooms. This area is quite isolated and it is impossible to integrate it meaningfully with the rest of the building at this time. Two walls were uncovered in this trench. Seven courses of the west face of a pier and rubble wall are visible in the east balk of the trench (locus CB 15003). This wall is founded at 462.66 m asl and is probably part of the Hellenistic Administrative Building. The trench was deeply disturbed by Roman-era rubble fills (loci CB 15007 and 15008), and no floors were preserved that can be associated with this wall. The other wall (locus CB 15002) runs east from the west balk of the trench. It stands to a height of 1.75 m, and when we stopped excavation at 462.49 m asl we had not yet reached the founding level. This wall is built of large flat blocks with a rubble core, in a technique unlike any of the other Hellenistic walls uncovered so far at the site. It resembles somewhat the walls visible in the banks of CB 3.6 and CB 1.6 (loci CB 36017 and 16015) and is on line with CB 16015. These walls may belong to a later building phase on the site. Alternatively, they may be part of a forecourt framing the south entrance to the building. Such forecourts are a feature of a number of Hellenistic palaces (Nielsen 1999: 115–28). A cobbled floor found south of wall CB 15002 along the west balk of CB1.5 at an elevation of 463.96 m asl (locus CB 15004) may be contemporary with that wall, although the latest material in the 6 kg of pottery recovered from the floor and the sealed fill beneath was Persian in date. A plaster floor patch to the north of the wall (locus CB 15005) did contain Hellenistic material.

**The Southern Portions of the Hellenistic Administrative Building (CA 9.6, West Quadrants and CB 1.6, SW Quadrant)**

We opened an area 15 m north-south by 5 m east-west south of the court and over the south wall of the large building. The excavated area begins 25 m west of the southeast corner of the building and 5 m south of the court. The latest preserved architecture here proved to be Hellenistic. The outstanding features include the south wall of the building (locus CA 96002), a parallel internal wall (CB 16001) 6 m to the north, and a bifurcated covered drain between these walls. Separate channels of the drain approach from the east (CA 96009/CB 16009) and west (CB 16010). These meet 3.5 m north of the south wall and form a single channel (locus CA 96009), which runs out of the building under that wall. We traced this channel 3 m to the south of the building, where it continued beyond the excavated area.

The stratigraphy in the area is compressed, with walls beginning to appear 15–20 cm below the modern surface and floors at 50 cm. The area underwent a number of modifications in the Hellenistic era. These are marked by patches of up to four superimposed earth/plaster floors and changing subdivisions of the space between the south wall of the building and the parallel wall to its north. The shallow fills between the floors and under the walls that we removed yielded very little datable material, but all was Hellenistic in date, and none was necessarily later than the middle of the second century B.C.E. From the relative sequence of walls and floors it is clear that the south wall of the building, the parallel wall to its north, and the drain were the only features built in the first phase of the Hellenistic building. All continued in use as long as the building was occupied. The later walls form a confusing warren of changing spaces that most likely date to the late second-century B.C.E. subdivision of the building even though there is no definitively later material in the sealed fills associated with them.

**WEST OF THE HELLENISTIC ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING**

We excavated in three grid squares west of the Hellenistic Administrative Building (fig. 20). These included the southwest quadrant of CB 3.8, the southwest quadrant of CB 3.9, and the northeast.

---

12Another east-west wall (CB 16015) can be seen in the north balk of CB 1.6. This wall is slightly off line from the walls of the building, and it is not possible at this time to sort out the nature of this peculiarity.

13The sealed fills—CA 96004.1, 96006.1, 96007.1, 96008.1, 96010, 96010.1, 96012, 96012.1, 96015, CB 16006.1, 16003, 16003.1—yielded 5.4 kg of pottery, of which the latest datable is matte red painted wares.
southeast, and southwest quadrants of WB 3.1, the grid square in which we had placed the original 1997 probe that produced several complete second-century B.C.E. vessels. The 5 × 5 m area immediately to the west of the Hellenistic Administrative Building (CB 3.8 SW) contained two scrappy late walls, which are probably Ottoman in date. These western structures consisted of sections of at least three buildings, two of which are Hellenistic in date and a third probably Roman or later. The pottery and other finds from the Hellenistic structures suggest that they are contemporary with the Hellenistic Administrative Building. We describe the western structures and their associated finds in more detail below.

The area opened in grids CB 3.9 and WB 3.1 ran continuously for 15 m east-west through the southern half of the grids. We opened one northern quadrant that gave us a 10-m north-south exposure in the center of the area. The entire sector was deeply disturbed by pits of Ottoman and Byzantine date, in places penetrating to and below the Hellenistic floors. The latest preserved architecture is the northeast corner of a building projecting into the southwest corner of the excavated area. The founding levels of the walls of this building (loci WB 31025

---

14 Although the walls (loci CB 38001 and 38002) and the sealed fills immediately below contained no material later than Hellenistic, they overlay a fill (locus CB 38013) that contained early modern Rashayya al-Fukhar ware as well as a pit of Byzantine date (locus CB 38015).
and 31026) were exposed 10–20 cm above the Hellenistic floors and nearly 1 m higher than the founding levels of the Hellenistic walls in the area. Due to the later pitting, no floors associated with the higher walls were preserved. On the basis of the founding level of the walls, we provisionally assign them a post-Hellenistic date, but further excavation to the south would be necessary to confirm and/or narrow the range of this date.

The Hellenistic structures uncovered in the west consist of northern and southern complexes. There are some indications that these may represent two building phases contemporary with the two phases of the Hellenistic Administrative Building. The walls of both complexes are built of cut rubble with cores of smaller unworked rubble. With a single exception (see below, locus WB 31011) there is none of the pier and rubble technique common in the Hellenistic Administrative Building. The southern complex is most extensively exposed. What remains of this structure is its northern wall (loci CB 39001/ WB 31008/WB 31009) and three interior walls (loci CB 39002, WB 31002, and WB 31037). These compose a large eastern courtyard and smaller rooms to its west. The northern wall of the complex appears to have two construction phases. In the first it is relatively narrow (about 70 cm in width), and in the second it is thickened on the north to a width of 1.2 m.

The courtyard of the southern complex measures 6.25 m east-west and at least 5 m north-south. Its northern wall is the north wall of the complex. The western wall (locus WB 31002) bonds with the earlier phase of the northern wall and is by its position clearly an internal wall. The eastern wall (locus CB 39002) is narrow, and we interpret this as an internal wall as well. It does not bond with the north wall and may belong to the later phase of the structure. The southern wall of the court must lie to the south of the excavated area. The court exhibits two types of flooring: a stone pavement (CB 39003) in the northeast corner and packed earth (CB 39012/WB 31020) in the remainder. There is a slight difference in elevation between the two floors, with the pavement lying some 10 cm higher (at 465.97 m asl) than the earth floor. The pavement is built up against what we interpret as the later phase of the north wall and should be contemporary with that later phase. However, the material sealed below these two floors shows no distinction in date. The latest datable items from all sealed loci are Hellenistic fine and plain wares. There is no ESA. A number of small stone structures built on the floor suggest that food or industrial preparation took place here, as do the finds from the floors and deposits immediately above. These include a restorable shouldered stewpot, made of Akko sandy cooking ware (K99 P65), one Phoenician semi-fine baggy jar (K00 P202), stone grinders and pestles and grindstones (K00 S6, S9), and a small pierced ceramic crucible (K99 P16).

Parts of two other rooms of the south complex have been exposed to the west of the court. The northern of these is a long narrow storeroom. This room is just 2 m wide, and we have exposed 5.25 m of its length. The north wall of the complex forms the north wall of this room. The west wall (locus WB 31002) is preserved in places to four courses in height but is robbed to below its foundation in the south; only the foundation course of the south wall is preserved (locus WB 31037), and that is missing at its east end where it would meet with wall WB 31002. We found an impressive assemblage of intact or largely restorable household artifacts in this small storeroom (fig. 21), including seven Phoenician semi-fine flanged rim juglets (Berlin 1997a: 53, pls. 10, 74) and eleven small ceramic stoppers that fit perfectly inside the juglets' mouths; one semi-fine flask (Berlin 1997a: 141, pls. 47, 48, 85); one semi-fine squat ointment pot (Berlin 1997a: 70–71, pls. 15, 76); three small cooking pots of Akko sandy cooking ware; two thick, pierced unfired clay discs (possibly loom weights); a black stone pestle; a limestone mortar; and half of a limestone trough (K97 S1–3). More household artifacts came from the churned-up layers above the floor (locus WB 31028–31036) and can be reasonably assigned to the assemblage originally stored in the room. These include an elongated semi-fine fusiform unguentarium (K00 P186), a fishnet weight and two pestles (K00 S21–23), an unusually tiny semi-fine flanged rim juglet (K00 P200), and an impressive 99 ceramic stoppers. Ten coins were found in these loci,
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15The sealed loci beneath the pavement are CB 39003.1 and CB 39014. These contained 14.2 kg of pottery. The latest from CB 39003.1 was Persian in date; that from CB 39014 was matte red painted wares. The locus beneath the earth floor CB 39013 contained 13 kg of pottery, the latest of which was Phoenician semi-fine. The earth floor itself contained a Byzantine coin (K00 C22), bearing witness to the deep penetration of the late pits.

16This room resembles the storerooms off the central court of the fourth-century B.C.E. Phoenician "palace" at Idalion (Hadjicostis 1995; 1997; M. Hadjicostis, personal communication).
Fig. 21. Pottery and objects from small storeroom in WB 3.1.

ranging in date from the early third century to 140 B.C.E. (K97 C1, K00 C29, 31, 42, 44, 47–50, 57–58). The second room west of the court is less well preserved. It lies just south of the storeroom and may have served the same purpose. We have only the north wall of the room, which is in fact the south wall of the storeroom described above (locus WB 31037). Much of this southern room is obscured by the unremoved later walls in the southwest of the area (loci WB 31025 and 31026), and the rest is disturbed by the late pits. Part of a stone, hearthlike structure (WB 31038) is preserved against the north wall. A cluster of six stoppers was found in this area as well.

The northern complex has been exposed only in the northeast quadrant of WB 3.1, which we excavated for a short time in 1999. This area is characterized by a deep deposit of solid rubble (WB 31024), which appears to be debris from the Hellenistic walls. We have not reached the bottom of the rubble layer through much of the area. Consequently, almost no floors and none of the founding levels of the walls were exposed. The walls of the northern complex consist of the later, thickened portion of the north wall of the southern complex (locus WB 31009) and a single north-south wall (locus WB 31010). This wall runs for 3.5 m and forms a corner with a badly robbed pier and rubble wall (locus WB 31011) some 80 cm north of the north wall of the southern complex. A plaster floor (locus WB 31023) was exposed south of this corner at an elevation of 465.82. This floor ran under the thickened, later phase of the northern wall of the south complex, where that wall had been robbed at the corner of walls WB 31008/009 and WB 31002.

With the evidence currently in hand it would appear that the northern and southern complexes were originally two structures separated by a narrow alley marked by floor WB 31023. Then at some later time the two complexes were joined when the north wall of the southern complex was widened (locus WB 31009). We assume that at this time wall WB 31010 was extended southward over the plaster floor to meet with wall WB 31009. It seems reasonably clear
that the courtyard of the southern complex remained in use at this time and was possibly expanded and the stone paving (locus CB 39003) added. It is less clear whether the storerooms to the west of the court remained in use during this phase. Later still the corner between walls WB 31008/009 and WB 31010 was robbed, exposing once again plaster floor WB 31023. The latest material recovered from the soil immediately over the floor (locus WB 31022) was early Roman in date. This interpretation is based on a small sample of material, and only further excavation, including the removal of wall WB 31009, can confirm or overturn it.

**THE BYZANTINE CHAPEL**

We spent three weeks of the 1999 season working in the northeast sector of grid square WC 4.1, which lies near the center and highest point of the south tel. We excavated an area 7.5 m north-south by 5 m east-west, where we found the southern end of a mortuary chapel just below the modern surface (fig. 22). The exposed architecture consists of north-south (locus WC 41001) and east-west walls (WC 41013), which form the southeastern corner of the structure; a curved wall (locus WC 41012) running southwest is framed within this corner. A monochromatic mosaic floor (locus WC 41002/41003), made up of white tesserae (about 2 × 2 cm each), lies outside the chapel to the west at an elevation of 466.73/466.67 m asl. The mosaic runs up to the west wall of the chapel and is joined to it by stucco. It is preserved in three discrete patches. In the northernmost of these the tesserae are laid irregularly, most likely the sign of a later repair. Within the chapel we found six irregular heaps of stone oriented east-west, which are most likely burials. We opened one and found a human skull. We then recovered the burial and backfilled the trench. The fill surrounding the burials contained Byzantine-period pottery (fourth through sixth centuries C.E.) as the latest datable material as well as a fragment of a glass bracelet (K99 G2), the bottom of a blown glass jug (K99 G3), and a stone pendant inscribed with the Christian chi-rho symbol (K99 S4).

Parallels for this architectural form—an apse framed within a rectangular structure—occur elsewhere in Galilean church architecture, notably at Kursi and Horvat Hesheq (Tzaferis 1993; Aviam...
1993). These parallels, however, derive from structures considerably larger, and which formed part of much grander ecclesiastical complexes. Our building is unique by virtue of its small size and the burials within. We tentatively identify this as a family or clan mortuary chapel dating from the Byzantine period. What is most surprising about the discovery of an apparently Christian chapel at Kedesh is that the population in the immediate locale was largely Jewish, as evidenced by the dense distribution of synagogues from Peqiin and Sasa to Gush Halav and throughout the Mt. Meiron region. The border of the Archdiocese of Tyre has been postulated to extend just east of Suhmata, stopping at a line from Peqiin to Sasa (Aviam 1993: 65). The discovery of this Christian chapel at Kedesh reopens this issue, and may indicate that the Tyrian archdiocese extended as far east as Kedesh in the Byzantine period.

THE STEP TRENCH AND ASSOCIATED PROBES

We placed a step trench on the south slope of the north tel and three probes in the saddle between the tels. Our intention was to discover what preserved stratigraphy might be traced between the modern village visible at the top of the tel and the classical remains on the south tel. While these explorations did give us a sample of the mediaeval through Ottoman occupation layers at Kedesh, they did not provide the sought after continuum, since the preserved architecture dropped precipitously from Abassid to middle Roman to Middle Bronze Age.

The first probe, CD 5.8, lay on the southeast edge of the saddle as it begins to rise up to the south tel. This was excavated from the modern surface (465.80 m asl) to a depth of 464.19 m asl. It produced mixed fills with modern material to the bottom. The second probe, CD 7.8, was a 2 x 2 m test located near the low point of the saddle where the modern surface dips to 464.90 m asl. Here we reached a layer of impenetrable rubble immediately below topsoil. The third probe, CD 8.7, lay at the north edge of the saddle as it begins to climb to the north tel. The 2 x 2 m test was excavated from a high point of 466.58 to 464.81 m asl. We uncovered no architecture in this area, but the lower fills (loci CD 87003 and 87004) produced the best sample of Byzantine-period ceramics yet found on the site, including a Cypriot red slip plate (K99 P4; Hayes 1972: fig. 80, form 1), a cooking ware jug from the Kfar Hananya pottery (K99 P36; Adan-Bayewitz 1993: 139–41, type 5B), one small cooking pot of Banias ware (Berlin 1999: fig. 12.1), and three cooking pots and one lid of Hawarit ware (Berlin 1999: 40, fig. 12.3, 6; Hartal 1989: pl. 15.11, with correct titles on p. 244).

The step trench, WE 3.2, is located midway up the north tel just south of the lowest visible modern terrace wall (fig. 23). We excavated an area 10 m north-south by 5 m east-west, comprising the east half of the grid square. The modern surface slopes from a high point of 474.51 m asl in the north to 473.21 in the south. The later architecture is much better preserved in the northern half of the sector, where we uncovered parts of two rooms of a substantial structure. Even here, however, erosion and modern activities have left only scanty intact use deposits by which to date the history of the structure. From the minimal evidence available we suspect that it was originally built in the Abassid era and remained in use with modifications through at least the Fatimid period. A substantial pavement provides the terminus post quem for its use (locus WE 32001) which covers it at an elevation of 474.15 m asl. The latest datable material under this pavement is early modern Rashayya al-Fukhar ware (Zebulon 1974; figs. 2–7).

It is in the north room of the structure that we found the best-preserved deposits. We exposed an area about 4 m east-west by 2.5 m north-south. This is delineated on the east by a substantial stone wall (locus WE 32002/32020) which is probably the external wall of the building. A less well-built cross wall (locus WE 32003) divides the north room from the south. Three superimposed plaster/cobble floors are preserved against the east wall of the north room and provide the material by which to date the construction and use of the building. These floors are preserved only in a small area, where the Ottoman pavement protected them from later disturbance and erosion. The material from in and under these small patches of flooring is scanty and possibly contaminated. Consequently, while the relative sequence in the area is secure, the absolute dates must be considered provisional. The highest of the floors (locus WE 32005) lies at an elevation of 473.89 m asl, and the latest material beneath is fragmentary buff ware (Khirbet Mefjar) jugs (WE 32019). The intermediate floor (locus WE 32008) lies some 20 cm lower, and

---

17 The excavation of the step trench was supervised by Brandon Foster in 1999 and by Nicola Arravecchia in 2000. The probes in the saddle were overseen by Geoffrey Compton.
the latest material below it (WE 32008.1) is reverse slip ware of the Frankish period. The lowest floor is 10 cm lower at 473.61 m asl. Green glazed pottery, possibly of the Fatimid era, is the latest material reported below this floor, but that might be the result of contamination from the foundation trench of a later wall (locus WE 32006, discussed below; on other Fatimid-era farmsteads in the immediate area, see Stern and Stacey 2000). A cobble floor in the narrow area exposed to the east of the room probably belongs to this same use phase (locus WE 32007, elevation 473.56 m asl), but we left this in place and so have no finds by which to date it.

A use phase later than the floors in the north room is documented by a wall (locus WE 32006) running west of, and parallel to, the east wall of the room. This west wall also shows signs of being rebuilt at its uppermost levels (locus WE 32020). The foundation trench of this wall cuts through the earlier floors associated with the room but is also covered by the Ottoman pavement. The latest datable material in the sealed fill beneath the wall (locus WE 32006.1) is green glazed pottery of the Frankish period.

We cleared an area 4 m east-west by 2 m north-south in the south room. Much of the southern part of the room has been lost to erosion. In fact, only a strip about 1 m wide along the north is preserved. The room is demarcated on the north by a cross wall (WE 32003) that separates it from the north room and on the east by the east wall of the building (WE 32002). A small piece of stone flooring is preserved built into the northeastern corner of the room (locus WE 32010). We removed the small section of wall WE 32002 preserved in the southeastern quadrant of the trench. The latest datable material directly under the wall was Iron Age, but Early Islamic pottery was found in the fill below this (locus WE 32025).\footnote{Frankish-period pottery was found in the makeup of the wall itself, but since this was covered by topsoil, we do not consider it to be a sealed context.} A pit (locus WE 32030) containing a beaker and jug,
both of Abassid-period buff ware, as well as a foot of an African Red Slip plate, cut into the northwest corner of the room.

The remains below the Early Islamic/Abassid structure are patchy and difficult to interpret. There are superimposed fills on the northeast side in which the latest datable materials are Hellenistic/Persian in the higher locus (WE 32026) and pre-Persian in the lower locus (WE 32031). On the west side of the area is a small area (roughly 1 × 2 m) in which three superimposed cobbled floors are preserved from earlier occupation phases. The highest of these (locus WE 32021) lies at an elevation of 472.73 m asl, and the latest datable material below it consisted of wall fragments of storage jars covered in thin, sharply edged ribbing that cannot date earlier than the late second–early third century C.E. The second floor (locus WE 32022) lay some 20 cm below the first, and the third (locus WE 32024) 20 cm lower, at 472.31. We recovered a sizable and coherent group of pottery from beneath both the second and third floors, and none dates later than the Middle Bronze IIA period (fig. 24:1–3; K00 P66, P67, P71–74; cf. Golani and Yoge 1996: figs. 2.3, 3.4).19

**HISTORICAL CONCLUSIONS**

At Kedesh, we have discovered a heretofore unknown, large administrative complex, clearly in use during the earliest period of Seleucid control of Syro-Palestine and abandoned around the middle of the second century B.C.E. The finds from the building show compelling affinities with a complex of material culture that we have elsewhere proposed as belonging to Hellenistic Phoenicia (Herbert 1994; Berlin 1997a; 1997c). Some of these finds, especially the sealings from the archive, also display the considerable influence of the Greek artistic tradition.

The area of the Hellenistic Administrative Building was reoccupied shortly after its abandonment, by people living in a much less grandiose manner, but whose material culture retains its closest affinities with Hellenistic Phoenician remains. There are indications that the Hellenistic complex was built over a similar Persian-period structure, and, although the use of this particular area of the tel in the Ptolemaic era is unclear, we do know from the Zenon papyri that the site was occupied in that era and was important enough to merit a stop on that official’s third-century B.C.E. visit.

The discovery of a Hellenistic (and probably Persian) administrative center in this border area, between the holdings of the autonomous city of Tyre and the sector of Coele-Syria known as the Upper Galilee, or “Galilee of the gentiles” (1 Macc 5:15; Frankel et al. 2001: 110, 141–42), has significant potential for amplifying and reorienting our conceptions of the political, social, and economic relations of the various cultural groups living in the southern Levant in the second half of the first millennium B.C.E. In this report, which is essentially a preliminary account of the results of three excavation seasons, we can hardly do justice to the breadth and complexity of the issues that are raised. Nonetheless, it seems reasonable to set out some major historical points on which these findings reflect. These points are: (1) the form that Persian administration of the region took from the fifth century B.C.E., as now clarified by the new evidence of the finds from Kedesh; (2) relations between the Tyrians, their Seleucid patrons, and the Jews in the first half of the second century B.C.E.; and (3) the significant change in the balance of power in the region as revealed by the nature and timing of the abrupt dissolution of the administrative base at Kedesh just after the middle of the second century B.C.E., which we believe is relevant to understanding contemporary developments elsewhere in the Seleucid Empire, and particularly in Judaea.

---

19We thank Nimrod Getzov, of the Israel Antiquities Authority, for identifying this material.
Administration of the Galilee under Persian Rule

In several areas of the Hellenistic Administration Building, we discovered an earlier architectural phase whose plan, size, and monumental character are consistent with its identification as a public building similar to that of the Hellenistic Administrative Building itself. In every place that this earlier phase was uncovered, the latest datable material—though scanty—indicates construction by the first half of the fifth century B.C.E. The presence of no fewer than 11 large column drums reused in the walls of the eastern rooms of the Hellenistic building testify to the monumental nature of the Persian predecessor.\footnote{Although it is possible that these columns could have come from a Ptolemaic predecessor, nothing among the current finds would support the existence of such a structure. Equally, what we know of the Ptolemaic administration of the area would not lead us to expect such a grandiose administrative center under their control.} Persian palatial structures are known for their use of columned halls, and in fact E. Stern attributes the introduction of Greek-style round columns in Palestine to the Persians (1982: 60). The discovery of a fifth-century B.C.E. sealing of definite Persian origin (K99 BL1247; fig. 25) further supports the identification of this predecessor as Persian in date and administrative in function. This seal, which shows two ibexes flanking a tree of life, is very close in style, iconography, and shape to one used by a court official on tablets in the Persepolis Fortification archive ratifying texts dated to years 22 and 23 of Darius the Great, i.e., 500 B.C.E.\footnote{The sealing was not found in the Hellenistic archive but in a Byzantine-period pit in area WB 3.1. We thank Margaret Cool Root for the identification and dating of the sealing. For the Persepolis Fortification tablets in general, see Garrison and Root 2001. The parallel for our seal will be published in volume 3 of this series (currently in preparation) in the section “Images of Flora, Fauna and Geometric Devices.”} Finally, the pottery assemblage so far recovered from the Persian period points to a population that enjoyed the imported luxury products of the elite. These include over 50 fragments of fifth-century B.C.E. Attic table wares as well as two Chian amphoras (K99 P12, K00 P132).

The political division of the southern Levant during this period has long been understood as consisting largely of straightforward borrowings of the Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian arrangements, with the only changes being the promotion of different towns as district administrative centers (e.g., Aharoni 1962: 357; Rainey 1969: 64–65; E. Stern 1982: 237–53; 1990: 221). Thus, from the time of the conquests of Tiglath-Pileser III, the southern Phoenician coast, including the cities of Sidon and Tyre, comprised the client “Kingdom of the Sidonians” which included Tyre (Oded 1974: 47–49). Sidon remained the chief city of the kingdom until its destruction in 351 B.C.E., at which time Tyre became preeminent among the Phoenician city states (Elayi 1982: 85; Oded 1974: 45). The mountains and hills of Upper and Lower Galilee, on the other hand, formed the interior Assyrian province Magidû, with an administrative center at Megiddo (Millard 1994: 61; Parpola and Porter 2001: map 23). Phoenician semi-autonomy survived the Neo-Babylonian assaults of 604–586 B.C.E., but the administrative importance of Megiddo seems to have disappeared at least by the time of the Persian conquest. Evidence for early (i.e., later sixth—early fifth century B.C.E.) Achaemenid administrative organization has, until now, comprised sporadic archaeological finds such as throne parts at Samaria.
(Tadmor 1974), the Eshmunazar inscription attesting
to Phoenician hegemony of the coastal plain as far
south as Joppa (Cooke 1903: 30–33), locally minted
coinage (Machinist 1994), and the books of Ezra
and Nehemiah, which focus on the Jewish commu-
nity’s repatriation to Jerusalem.

None of this evidence is specifically pertinent to
the Galilee, and the absence of direct information
has made it difficult to reconstruct the region’s offi-
cials, identify its regional capital, and
and characterize its ethnic makeup (Aharoni 1967: 356–
Leith 1998: 383; Elayi and Sapin 1998: 18; Frankel
et al. 2001: 107–8). Most reconstructions imagine
a “province” of Galilee separate both from Sa-
maria, whose northern border would then fall short
of the Jezreel Valley, and from the Phoenician cities,
whose hegemony covered coastal settlements only.
This reconstruction, which combines the Jezreel
Valley with Galilee, essentially reprises the Neo-
Assyrian arrangement, but identification of the cap-
it of the region has remained a matter of some
discussion. The extreme sketchiness of the Persian-
period remains at Megiddo (Lamon and Shipton
1939: 88–91) casts serious doubt on its continuing
as the region’s Achaemenid-period administrative
center. Alt suggested Akko, but this has been per-
suasively rejected (Aharoni 1967: 361 and n. 91). 
Avi-Yonah suggested Hazor as the center (1966:
25), and this has been accepted by some (Weinberg
1969: 86; Achteimeier 1985: map 9). Stern believes
that Megiddo continued as the region’s center (1982:
240), while Leith suggests that Megiddo perhaps
remained head of a southern sector while northern
Galilee could have been governed separately from
Hazor are not, however, consistent with an admin-
istrative center. Most tellingly, during the Persian-
period reoccupation of the main citadel building
many entrances were blocked, large halls were par-
titioned into small chambers, and various domestic
installations such as ovens and storage silos filled
some of the rooms (Yadin et al. 1958: 54–57). The
finds are comprised almost exclusively of locally
manufactured pottery and domestic items such as
loom weights (Yadin et al. 1958: 57–62). Finally, all
of the datable evidence clusters in the later fifth and
the early fourth centuries B.C.E., suggesting that re-
use of the building did not occur until midway
through the period (Yadin et al. 1958: 63).

Our discovery of an arguably Persian-period ad-
ministrative center at Ke'desh leads us to propose
this site as the regional center for the Tyrian interior
and Upper Galilee (minimally) during Achaemenid
times. The site’s proximity to Tyre leads to some
questions about the political relation between our
administrative center and the city itself. One inter-
pretation would be that this center represents Tyrian
hegemony over the Galilee. Such a suggestion does
immediately raise the question of why Tyre would
be granted this large and novel expansion of politi-
cal (and so probably economic) control. We would
tentatively offer a quid pro quo rationale: in the
early fifth century B.C.E. the Achaemenids granted
to the Phoenicians (probably Tyre specifically) in-
creased territory in exchange for naval assistance
(see already Katzenstein 1979: 30–31; Grainger
1991: 20; Markoe 2000: 49–52). At this time the
Persians were concentrated on expansion westward
into Greece, a strategy that required considerable
naval resources. Herodotus in fact lists the Phoeni-
cian contribution to Xerxes at the time of his inva-
sion in 481 B.C.E. as 300 ships along with armed
crews (Histories 7.89; cf. 8.67). There is also nu-
mismatic evidence attesting to an unusually close
relationship between the southern Phoenician cities
and the Achaemenid royal house: fifth-century B.C.E.
coins of Sidon depict the king of Persia himself as
the key figure on the obverse (Mildenberg 1994–
1999). This scenario—an exchange of Phoenician
territorial power for naval assistance—is similar to
that postulated by Oded (1974: 47–48) after the
conquests of Tiglath-Pileser III.

An equally plausible alternative, however, can be
deduced from the same scanty body of information
at hand. Although Tyre remained autonomous and
not subsumed into an Assyrian province even after
the Kingdom of Tyre and Sidon’s revolt against
Assyria and Hiram of Tyre’s subjugation sometime
between 734 and 732 B.C.E., there are reports in
administrative documents from Nimrud that Assyria
appointed “‘customs officials’ in the customs sta-
tions of the entire Lebanon” and intervened in the
commercial affairs of Tyre (Oded 1974: 47–48; cf.
Sartre 1989: 120). With the creation of a regional
center at a site demarcating the border between Tyre
and Galilee, it is possible that the Persians continued
the Assyrian practice of checking rather than aug-
menting the power of Tyre. We do know that the
residence of the Achaemenid satrap of Beyond the
River resided at Damascus. Kedesh is located just about halfway between that city and the coast, a logical situation for an Achaemenid observation and/or customs point.

Regardless of who controlled the Persian-period administrative center at Kedesh, scholars have generally agreed that in this period the Galilee was home to a mixed population that included significant numbers of Phoenicians or at least strong influences from the culture of coastal Phoenicia (E. Stern 1982: 240; Leith 1998: 386–87; Finkielsteyn in press: 1). The strongest argument for Phoenician population comes from the archaeological remains. The area’s material culture is identical to sites on the northern coast, but notably different from that of Samaria and certainly Judah (E. Stern 1982: 240). Survey along the modern, and probable ancient, road leading east from Tyre toward Kedesh has discovered several Persian-period remains, including a shaft grave and a stone-carved relief at Wadi Ashur (Elayi 1982: 96). A long-term analysis of both epigraphic and economic indicators has revealed the continued interests of Sidon and Tyre in Galilee—although these have been explained as casual rather than official (Rappaport 1992). A fifth-century B.C.E. curse tablet, written in Greek and found at Selinus in Sicily, cites one Phoenician father-son pair from Metuad, a community from the vicinity of the modern-day Metull, at the northern end of the Hula Valley, and Kedesh (Applebaum 1977: 384). Arguments for a Jewish component within this mixed population in Persian-period Galilee are late and literary. Aharoni (1967: 365) claimed that the Mishnah contends that there were probably three Jewish centers in this region in the Second Temple period—Judah, Gilead, and the Galilee. Some scholars have followed this view (M. Stern 1974: 262–63, 287), while others believe that the Jewish population of the Galilee in the Persian and early Hellenistic periods was minimal, and the Jewish population of the later Second Temple period comprised new arrivals or converts (Bar-Kochba 1977; Frankel et al. 2001: 109).

The Phoenicians and the Seleucids in the Early Second Century B.C.E.

The first half of the second century B.C.E. is a very well-documented period in the history of Palestine. This is the period in which the Seleucids finally won control over southern Phoenicia and Palestine, which event is reported on by many ancient historians (Schürer 1973: 17–67 provides an exhaustive and comprehensive list of ancient sources) as well as evidenced by contemporary inscriptions (e.g., Hefzibah inscription: Landau 1966). This is the era of the Maccabean uprising and attendant expansions, which are documented more or less faithfully by the two books of 1 and 2 Maccabees as well as by the partially reprised account of Josephus (AJ 12.246–13.222). A great deal of archaeological evidence may also be brought to bear on this short period (Berlin 1997b: 14–23). Finally, this is an era that has received a torrent of scholarly attention in modern times (see articles and bibliography in Davies and Finkelstein 1989). Within this wealth of reportage and analysis, however, there has been little attention given to the position and possible influences of the Phoenicians vis-à-vis either the Seleucids or the Jews (the notable exception is Grainger 1991: 116–28). This is due largely to three factors: (1) the absence of any contemporary or later historical account by or focused on the Phoenicians themselves; (2) the lack or extreme sketchiness of pertinent archaeological evidence; and (3) the focus of almost all ancient and modern inquiries on Judaea and the Hasmonaean kingdom.

Our excavations at Kedesh provide a new, broad, and detailed cache of material evidence pertinent to continuing Phoenician presence in the Galilee under the Seleucid regime. The Phoenician character of much of the second-century B.C.E. material record from the site is indisputable, particularly the sealings inscribed in Phoenician (see Ariel and Naveh, this issue). As in the Persian period, however, what this material record can tell us about the political role of Tyre in the region and its relation with the Seleucid overlords is limited and open to several interpretations.

Our actual documentary sources about the nature of Seleucid administration in Syria are fragmentary and scattered. There is little hard evidence concerning the extent and manner by which central control was exerted over local populations (Bickerman 1938: 133–210). In the words of M. Sartre

---

22 This is in direct contrast to the plethora of epigraphical material we have regarding Seleucid relations with the Greek poleis of Asia Minor (Welles 1974) and of course the extensive sources on Judaea mentioned above.
(1989: 1), “L’histoire administrative de la Syrie hellénistique reste encore à écrire... nous sommes in-capables de décrire avec un minimum de précision les systèmes administratifs séleucide et lagide en Syrie.” Scholars nonetheless generally postulate that once they had recovered Syro-Palestine from the Ptolemies, the area controlled by the Seleucids remained much the same as the Achaemenid fifth satrapy (i.e., Beyond the River) (Bickerman 1938: 197; Avi-Yonah 1966: 42; Sartre 1989: 120). Under the Seleucids this satrapy was called Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. Most scholars also believe that, as under the Persians, the Phoenician cities were not subjected to direct satrapal control but remained to a large extent autonomous (Bickerman 1938: 136, 140, 144; Sartre 1989: 120; Finkielstzejn in press: 4).

A more precise understanding of the administrative divisions of Seleucid Syria is further hampered by the overlapping and sometimes contradictory terminology that appears in those sources that do survive. While scholars largely agree that the largest governmental division in the Seleucid empire was the satrapy, and that these satrapies were divided into hierarchies of smaller administrative units, the relation of these units one to the other and to the central power along with their method(s) of governance—local, central, or some mix thereof—are all subjects of speculation. Even the names of the subdivisions are unclear; they vary from region to region through time and are often confused. Names of smaller units attested in Seleucid documents include mere, hyparchy, toparchy, and nome. Likewise the titles assigned to the rulers of these units often vary in what seems an arbitrary manner. For instance Polybius (Histories 5.46–47) calls a certain Diodotus an eparch, strategos, and strategos of the satrapy. Bickerman refers to this problem as “floating” nomenclature (1938: 203)

The best source on the administrative divisions of our area remains Strabo (Geography 16.2). Although Strabo is writing over a century after the heyday of the Seleucid Empire, he cites Posidonius, a Hellenistic-period historian, and the account does appear trustworthy. Strabo gives the boundaries of the region he calls Syria as the Mediterranean on the west, Cilicia on the north, the Euphrates River and Arabia Scenitae on the east, and Egypt and Arabia Felix in the south (Geography 16.2.1). He does not call this large region a satrapy, but its borders do coincide with those of the Persian satrapy “Beyond the River.” Strabo divides his Syria into five parts (mere) (Geography 16.2.2). These he calls, moving from north to south: (1) Commagene; (2) Seleucis of Syria; (3) Phoenicia, on the seaboard; (4) Coele-Syria, inland from Phoenicia on the north; and (5) Judaea, inland from Phoenicia on the south. He then notes, citing Posidonius, that Seleucis is divided into four satrapies as was Coele-Syria (Geography 16.2.4). Clearly these satrapies are smaller units than the great satrapy of Syria, which reconstituted the Achaemenid fifth satrapy.

Tarn (1961: 130–31) contends that the major satrapies were divided into eparchies and these into hyparchies to which the smallest unit, the village (komas), would report. Sartre (1989: 122) asserts that the Galilee would have been such an eparchy, based on the “aia” ending of its name. He acknowledges, though, that the term eparchy is attested nowhere in Seleucid documents but appears first under the Romans (1989: 122). This Galilean “eparchy” would probably coincide with what Strabo refers to as one of the four satrapies of Coele-Syria. The Hefzibah inscription (Landau 1966), found near Beth She’an at the border between the Jezreel Valley and Lower Galilee, throws more light on the administration of the Galilee under the Seleucids. The inscription dates to between 200 and 195 B.C.E. and records nine letters between Antiochus III and his

---

23 The situation is murkier under the Ptolemies. Although Egyptian records designate an area outside Egypt under this name, this does not necessitate a central administrative center or officials outside Egypt. Zenon does not mention any such officials (Sartre 1989: 121).

24 Posidonius, who lived from ca. 135–51 B.C.E., was born in Apamea but settled in his later life on the island of Rhodes. He was well-traveled and his writings, of which only fragments are now preserved, were highly respected by his contemporaries and successors (Kidd 1999: 3–5). Strabo is probably referring to Posidonius’ History but may have garbled the passage to some extent (Kidd 1988: 859–61). The real issue is the reliability of Strabo both in his use of his sources and reporting on his own travels. A reassessment for the better has been taking place in recent years (see most recently Dueck 2000).

25 It is these smaller units that Appian (The Syrian Wars 62) must be referring to when he says there were 72 satrapies under Seleucus I.

26 Polybius (Histories 5.46–47) does refer to Diodotus as an eparch, which implies the existence of eparchies in his time.
son and local officials. It names a certain Ptolemaios as strategos and chief priest. This is surely the same Ptolemaios Thraea named as strategos and chief priest of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia in OGIS 230 (Bickerman 1938: 198, n. 12; Landau 1966: n. 13). In his commentary Landau argues that the inscription shows that the strategos's powers were fairly strictly limited and that daily regional administration was in the hands of subalterns known as dioketai. These dioketai received orders directly from the king and acted through local financial officers known as oikonomoi (Landau 1966: 66–67). At some point there seem to be as many as four subfunctionaries operating in the district, indicating a complex subdivision and organization of the territory. In a re-edition of the Hefzibah inscription, Bertrand argued that this document attests to tensions between the local village governments, local dynasts such as Ptolemaios, and the central power of the Seleucid monarchs (1982: 174). However one reads the Hefzibah inscription, it, taken together with Strabo's account, makes it clear that at least the northern Galilee belongs to a separate governmental unit than Samaria and Judah at this time.

Where do our finds from Kedesh fit into all this? The large second-century B.C.E. building we have uncovered at Kedesh is undoubtedly the palatial residence and administrative center of an important official. This conclusion is based on the form and size of the building, its similarity to known governmental residences such as those at Lachish, Dura, Nippur, and Ai-Khanoum, the presence of large amounts of foodstuffs stored there, and, most importantly, the archive. The 2043 sealings uncovered in the northwest corner of the building testify that it served as a repository for a large number of records. What sort of records would these have been and what kind of official would have presided over such an archive?

The answers to the above questions can only be found through a detailed analysis of the sealings, their iconography and subject matter, and comparison of the total collection with other extant Hellenistic archives. We have compiled a summary identification and overview of the sealings in the year and a half since the excavation of the archive was completed and can offer some preliminary observations on the nature of the archive at this time. One thousand seven hundred and sixty-five of the sealings are readable; the others are missing the stamped face, are completely blurred, or are too fragmentary to identify in any meaningful way. In terms of subject and style the collection is overwhelmingly Greek, with 75 percent of the readable sealings bearing Greek mythological/anthropomorphic figures and another 20 percent consisting of Greek-style portraits (figs. 26–27). For the most part these are impressions from the kind of seal rings one would expect private individuals to use on a variety of documents, ranging from sales of property, to wills, marriage contracts, and the like. Very few of the sealings can be definitely identified as "official." (These are for the most part the inscribed pieces published in this issue by Ariel and Naveh.) Added to these are a small number of recognizable official Seleucid symbols, such as the anchor (fig. 28), of which we have seven examples, and the dolphin representing Tyre, of which we have five. The official or nonofficial status of the portraits is problematic. These are for the most part idealized representations of Seleucid monarchs. It is thought that such portraits were not used exclusively by the kings or their representatives but often taken by private individuals.

---

27Ptolemaios is never identified specifically as strategos of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia in the Hefzibah inscription itself, but that office is mentioned in lines 14–15 of the inscription (Landau 1966: 59). Interestingly the area is identified there as Syria and Phoenicia rather than Coele-Syria.

28This is contra Avi-Yonah's interpretation (1966: 25, 48) of a very difficult passage in 1 Maccabees (10.22–31), which he takes to indicate that Galilee and Samaria were one eparchy. Read at face value and as recapped in Josephus (AJ 13.46–54), this passage would have Demetrius cede all Samaria, Galilee, and the coast to Judah. See Goldstein (1976: 406–7) on the difficulties with which this text "bristles."

29This work has been carried out by Sharon Herbert and Donald T. Ariel, aided by Yael Barschak, Gabriella Bijoysky, and Helena Sokolov. Any errors in this short summary are the responsibility of Herbert.

30The iconography and style of these sealings depart dramatically from earlier Phoenician sealings (see Culican 1968 for an overview of a large group of earlier sealings).

31Sealings are rarely found together with the documents they sealed, since the originally unbaked clay sealings are usually only preserved when the archive is burned, thereby destroying the papyri records. The main exceptions to this rule are the 35 sealings from Elephantine and the Late Persian documents from Wadi Dalieh (Leith 1997). Vandorpe (1995) collects the 180 sealings found with papyri from Egypt. The only other instances in which we can connect sealings with their documents are Persian and Hellenistic cuneiform tablets (see Wallenfels 1996; Garrison and Root 2001).
Fig. 26. Seals with Aphrodites and Apollos.

(Inverizzi 1998: 107; Wallenfels 1996: 118). Some of our portraits must have been sealings of official correspondence from the Seleucid monarchs or their representatives, but many were probably from the rings of private individuals (for further discussion of this point, see Ariel and Naveh in this issue).

The sealings from Kedesh take their place among a dozen or so such finds from throughout the Hellenistic world (see Boussac 1988: 307–8 for an overview; Boussac and Invernizzi 1996). They comprise one of the very few groups to have been found in a sealed primary deposit, and the largest group for which it can be convincingly argued that the entire archive has been recovered. It has long been recognized that not all Hellenistic archives are “official” in the sense that they constitute royal or even municipal repositories of public records. Rather, many of the ancient archives are collections of personal records kept in individuals’ houses, such as those from the American excavations at Seleucia on the Tigris (McDowell 1935; F. E. Brown 1938), or deposited in the care of private bankers, such as those from the house in the Skardana quarter on Delos (Boussac 1988; 1992). The criteria that are generally applied to determine the official or non-official nature of any given archive center are the form of the building in which they were found and the nature of the representations on the sealings themselves. Buildings such as the archive found by

---

32 More than 30,000 sealings were found in the archive excavated by the Italians at Seleucia, but the entire southern half of the building had apparently been swept clean of sealings in antiquity (Invernizzi 1976: 170). The majority of the 16,000+ sealings from Delos were recovered from the excavator’s dump (Boussac 1992: 1–2).
the Italian excavators at Seleucia are clearly official. That structure is 140 m long and consists of two suites of seven long, narrow interconnecting rooms with bays for shelves on both sides (Invernizzi 1976: 170). It is clearly a building designed for and dedicated to storage of enormous numbers of records; the presence of such a building in one of the two major capitals of the Seleucid Empire is hardly surprising. The subject matter of the sealings reinforces the public nature of the archive: over half record payment or exemption from the annual salt tax (Invernizzi 1968–1969; 1985; 1996; and personal communication). Other public archives were situated in temple complexes such as that at Hellenistic Uruk (Rostovtzeff 1932; Bickerman 1938: 209), where sealings of Seleucid officials such as the chreophylax and bibliophylax came to light. At the other end of the spectrum are the 16,000+ sealings from Delos, which were found in a private house of unexceptional form and from whose 14,000 or so readable impressions only 30 (barely .02 percent) can be identified as official (Boussac 1992: 11–18). The archive from Kedesh would appear to fall somewhere in the middle of the spectrum. It is clearly housed in a public building, but not one designed to be exclusively an archive. Relatively few (somewhere around 5 percent) of the impressions can be identified with certainty as official, and none of these carry inscriptions of royal officials such as the chreophylax.33 Indeed, our most common official seal is inscribed in Phoenician and carries the Phoenician symbol of Tanit. The inscription names as owner of the seal “he who is over the land.” As Ariel and Naveh point out, this designation is unparalleled in either Hebrew or Phoenician; its closest parallel

Fig. 27. Seals with portraits.

33The figure of 5 percent is a very rough estimate. It includes the 22 inscribed sealings treated by Ariel and Naveh (this volume) plus the seven anchor and five dolphin sealings. If we assume that about 15 percent of the portraits are indeed official, which would seem to be a very conservative estimate, we come up with 5 percent of the 1765 identifiable sealings from the archive as “official.”
is a Phoenician inscription from Cyprus, which is interpreted as “chief of the land,” “governor of the district” (Ariel and Naveh in this issue, under no. 1).

To return to our original questions, what light do the Kedesh finds shed on the nature of Seleucid administration in the Galilee and the ethnic identity of the inhabitants? We would suggest that at Kedesh we have the residence either of the governor of the eparchy of the Galilee (under whatever name it went in the Seleucid era, possibly mere) or of the strategos of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia—the Ptolemaios of the Hefzibah inscription and his successors. The scanty evidence for official Seleucid correspondence might appear to argue against the identification as residence of the strategos. On the other hand, we know from 2 Macc 8.8 that it was the strategos of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia (another Ptolemaios) who mustered the troops to fight against Judas Maccabee. Is it just coincidence that one cohort of those troops encamped at Kedesh and after their defeat in the plain of Hazor were pursued to Kedesh?

The ethnic identity of the official at Kedesh, whether strategos or eparch or diakatas, along with the other inhabitants, is even more problematic. Our official uses Phoenician script and the Tanit sign on his seal. Should we take this as an indication that he considers himself ethnically Phoenician or, alternatively, could this be an instance of a Graeco-Macedonian official appropriating the symbols of the indigenes in order to validate his rule? As to the rest of the population, although on face value the overwhelmingly Greek iconography of the sealings would seem to indicate a Greek, or at least strongly Hellenized population, how closely individuals identified themselves with their sealings and the representations thereon is a tricky issue (Garrison and Root 2001: 7, 11, 12). From the few instances where we have a sealing and the name of the individual preserved together, we learn that individuals could use several seals in their lifetimes and at times loan their seals to others (Wallenfels 1996: 119). On the Egyptian papyri where the names of the individuals can be connected with their seals, there is almost no connection between Greek and/or Egyptian names and Greek and/or Egyptian imagery on the associated sealings (Vandorpe 1995).

Leaving the sealings aside, the remainder of the material assemblage, which is mainly pottery, is of local and Phoenician manufacture with an admixture of imported products from Greece, the Aegean, Egypt, and Italy. Strabo, writing more than a century after the fact, characterizes the Hellenistic inhabitants of the Galilee, along with other areas of southern Syria including Judaea as “mixed stocks of people from Aegyption and Arabian and Phoenician tribes” (Geography 16.2.34). The open-air sanctuary at Mizpeh Yamim, not far from Kedesh, illustrates this mixed character dramatically in its Hellenistic finds. These include a bronze situla from Egypt inscribed in Phoenician letters to Astarte, as well as a statuette of the Egyptian gods Isis, Osiris, and Horus (Frankel 1993: 1063; Frankel et al. 2001: 110). It seems clear that Kedesh in the Hellenistic period was home to a mixed population among whom Hellenized Phoenicians from Tyre probably predominated. But what of the political control of the site and the region over which it looms, the Upper Galilee? Although an argument could be made based on the Phoenician nature of the assemblage and the Phoenician script of many of the official sealings that the site was an outpost of Tyre itself, it seems more likely that it was under the control of an official who reported directly to the Seleucid monarch (as reflected in the Hefzibah inscription). One slight piece of evidence to add to this interpretation
is the city seal, inscribed in Greek “Kydissa” (Ariel and Naveh in this issue, no. 5). Finally, given the mixed nature of the region’s population, that of the site’s need not have been limited to either Greeks or Phoenicians. It may be that as Finkielstein proposes for Marisa (1999: 59), there are both Greek and indigenous (in the case of Marisa, Idumaeans) administrators.

The End of the Hellenistic Administrative Building and an Administrative Presence in Galilee

The archaeological evidence for an abrupt but temporary abandonment of the Hellenistic Administration Building shortly after the middle of the second century B.C.E. is clear. Sealed below the building collapse in the NW Archive room were two Rhodian amphoras, one dating to 146 B.C.E. and the other between 180 and 145 B.C.E.; sealed below the collapse in the Corridor was one dated sealing (Ariel and Naveh in this issue, no. 3) from 148 B.C.E. While we cannot yet delineate the precise order of events, several aspects are unequivocal:

1. The Hellenistic Administrative Building suffered at least two damaging episodes during the third quarter of the second century B.C.E., the earlier being the hasty abandonment of the building itself along with the complex directly west of it, and the later being the deliberate burning of the NW Archive room. The secure assignment of the two infant burials found within that room to one or the other of these episodes is not possible at this time, although it seems likelier that these are associated with the later episode.

2. Parts of the Hellenistic Administrative Building, specifically the eastern portions of the building, were reoccupied in the later second century B.C.E., probably in the later third/early fourth quarters of the century. This reoccupation seems to have been reasonably prosperous, with residents acquiring imported and regional luxury table wares (primarily ESA, as well as Cypriot and Egyptian vessels: fig. 16:1–5). At this time we are unable to determine if this reoccupation might have begun at the same time as the later, burning episode described above, or if this constitutes a third “event” within the second half of the second century B.C.E. In either case, however, it is clear that the building no longer functioned as an administrative center.

3. The Hellenistic Administrative Building was finally abandoned as a living space by the early first century B.C.E., although the fact that walls were robbed for building stone in the later first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E. suggests that the village of Tyrians cited by Josephus (JW 4.104) probably existed on the mound, in the near vicinity of the building. None of the evidence for subsequent occupation, which is admittedly scanty, suggests that the site ever again enjoyed the status that it had from the fifth through the mid-second centuries B.C.E.

In terms of Hellenistic history, the most salient aspect of the above points is the evidence they afford for the abrupt disappearance of the site’s administrative hegemony. One possible reconstruction would see the first, abandonment, phase of the Hellenistic Administrative Building as occasioned by the rapid arrival at Kedesh of the forces of Jonathan, in his pursuit of the army of Demetrius in or just after 145 B.C.E. Our discovery of so much intact material on the floors of both the Hellenistic Administrative Building and the complex to the west indicates that the Maccabees did not, in fact, inflict much material damage. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Maccabees stayed to inhabit the site. Thus the Tyrians, upon their recovery of the site and the building, might have readily cleaned up and continued their administrative duties. The evidence, however, reveals that they did not. Instead, there occurred a second, far more damaging, episode of deliberate burning of the NW Archive Room. The likeliest actors in this second episode are the Tyrians themselves, returning to the site after the Maccabean forces withdrew. What might have motivated such an action on their part? It is tempting to see their pointed destruction of the NW Archive Room as an expression of contempt for the imperial regime under which they had lived and on whose behalf they had served. In this, the Tyrians would have acted just as did the Jews in Jerusalem on the eve of the Revolt, when a group stormed the city’s record office and burned the documents therein (JW 2.327; see also 6.354). It may not be coincidental that the Tyrian numismatic record also reflects a new

---

34It is notable that, relatively speaking, the late Hellenistic inhabitants of Kedesh do not display anywhere near as affluent a lifestyle as their neighbors at the much smaller site of Tel Anafa. Many more imported products were found there, as well as thousands of cast glass bowls, while we have recovered only a few such vessels at Kedesh. In addition we found only two Rhodian wine jars dating to this final Hellenistic phase (see table 2).
sense of autonomy and defiance at this time: in 141/140 B.C.E. the city’s coinage proclaims itself—
for the first time—“holy” and “asylu" (Grainger

If the scenario suggested above is borne out by
additional research, it would lead to one final, and
especially poignant, point. The probable years in
which the site’s Tyrian residents would have re-
turned and enacted the events that we have found
evidence of are the late 140s B.C.E.—the years just
after the battle between Jonathan and Demetrius.

This is the precise period that the Maccabees, in
Jerusalem, finally managed to expel the city’s Seleu-
cid garrison in the Akra, and return the city to
unopposed Jewish rule. We know of the emotions and
the drama of 142 B.C.E. in Jerusalem thanks to the
almost contemporary report preserved in 1 Macc-
bees (13.49–52). The Phoenicians left no compara-
tive literary or historical accounting. What the written
record cannot tell us, however, the archaeological
record now may.
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