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Abstract

The primary aim of this thesis is to examine the scholarly discourse surrounding the recent excavations conducted by Eilat Mazar at the ‘City of David’ site in Jerusalem, specifically her claims regarding the unearthing of King David’s palace. Through an analysis of the reports and results published by prior excavators of the ‘City of David’ site, Mazar’s conclusions regarding King David’s palace will be critiqued, as will the ideologies of her chief sources of funding, the Jerusalem based Shalem Centre and the Ir David Foundation. Social context surrounding Mazar’s excavations will also be examined, highlighting text often omitted from archaeological discourse, such as popular magazine articles, tourist pamphlets and blogs, in order to better understand both the ideological and political agendas that impacting upon Mazar’s conclusions and publications.

The politicization of archaeology throughout the Near East, whether it is omission of Muslim history from Jerusalem tourist brochures or the complete denial of any Jewish historical claims to the Temple Mount, is an issue that greatly effects the interpretation, publication and dissemination of scholarly debate. Eilat Mazar’s work at the ‘City of David’ is a prime example of this issue, for while archaeologists internationally and domestically continue to debate her conclusions, the popular press has presented her findings as near definitive facts. Mazar’s aim to uncover the palace of King David is therefore not the primary issue, for although her belief in the historicity of the biblical narrative certainly influences her results, it is of greater concern that the public’s access
to all academic arguments and theories is being limited. The fact that in over fifty articles published about Mazar’s discovery of King David’s palace not a single one mentions that her conclusions are based on preliminary results illustrating this lack of transparency.

Ultimately it is the intention of this thesis to not only present the arguments for and against Eilat Mazar’s interpretations regarding King David’s palace, by comparing her conclusions with those of prior excavators and recent academic responses, but also to show the motivations behind her results and the impacts of funding, politics and faith (social context) can have upon scholarly conclusions.
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Introduction

It is the aim of this thesis to discuss the recent excavations conducted at the ‘City of David’ site by Eilat Mazar through applying discourse analysis to the topic rather than simply reviewing Mazar’s site reports and strictly academic publications. In order to better understand the conclusions Mazar has reached concerning King David’s Palace it is deemed important to address texts outside the traditional scope of archaeological discussions. Hence while the data Mazar presents in her reports remains vital to understanding the archaeological context of the ‘City of David’ site, it is also necessary to examine the social context in which these results were obtained and interpreted. It is only then that a complete understanding will emerge of why Mazar has concluded her excavations have uncovered King David’s Palace.

In order to best highlight the archaeological and non-academic influences helping to dictate Eilat Mazar’s work, the various categories of texts relating to the topic will be separated into individual chapters in order to better explain Mazar’s archaeological results, concluding with an examination her sources of funding and the wider politicization of archaeology within the state of Israel. Chapter one deals exclusively with the choice of discourse analysis as a method of discussing social context in archaeology, following prior work in the field by Christopher Tilley and Ian Morris, in order to show how such analysis can enhance our understanding of Mazar’s conclusions by moving beyond the excavation report to texts traditionally omitted from archaeological discourse.

Chapter two aims to provide an archaeological genealogy of the site in order to present both context and background for Mazar’s conclusions. Examining the conclusions and material evidence from three previous campaigns at the site where Mazar now claims to have uncovered King David’s Palace, chapter two essentially endeavors to provide all the archaeological data available prior to the commencement of Mazar’s first excavation season in 2005.
Chapter three addresses the extra biblical references pertaining to King David, examining in detail the authenticity and translation of two inscriptions attributed to the 9th century BCE. Both the Tel Dan Inscription and the Mesha Stele arguably contain references to a political entity known as the ‘House of David’, suggesting that rather than a fictional character David may have been a legitimate monarch and founder a dynasty.

Chapter four correlates both archaeological and biblical evidence in order to address the question of King David as a truly historical figure. By comparing the material evidence for King David’s accomplishments, the stories told of him in Bible and the dates these tales were first composed a chronological bracket for King David’s reign be established, while the instances of David having been attributed the successes of other biblical figures, such as Eurtha and King Omri of Israel, will also be explored.

With the conclusions of prior excavators and the recent translation of extra biblical evidence to support the historicity of King David, chapter five focuses on the field work, publications and conclusions presented by Eilat Mazar. Gathering information presented in prior chapters and thoroughly discussing alternative interpretations of Mazar’s results, chapter five aims to show that based on the material evidence, regardless of the history presented in the biblical narrative, there remains little proof that King David’s Palace has been uncovered by Mazar.

To conclude, chapter six aims to explore the wider social context surrounding Mazar’s campaigns in order to show that rather then adhering to the facts as presented by the material evidence, ideology has also played a role in forming Mazar’s conclusions. Examining information ranging from Internal Revenue Service reports through to tourist brochures and radio interviews, this chapter explores texts outside the realm of traditional archaeological research in order to show that seemingly unconnected, popular and administrative texts can serve an important role in fully understanding the results presented in academic publications.
An important note in respect to chronology must also be made prior to addressing Mazar’s ‘City of David’ excavations considering recent debate over traditional dating methods. Although Israel Finkelstein of Tel Aviv University has presented arguments to suggest that the traditional system for dating both the Late Iron Age I and Early Iron Age II periods in Israel should be adjusted\(^1\), for convenience the traditional ‘modified conventional chronology’\(^2\) will be employed in order to better correlate past and present excavations at the site.

\(^1\) Finkelstein 2005, 34.
Chapter One

Discourse Analysis and its Application for Examining the ‘City of David’
Excavations by Eilat Mazar (2005–2008)

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the methodological approach adopted for examining discussions of the purported discovery of King David’s Palace by Eilat Mazar. Following previous use of discourse analysis in archaeology by Ian Morris and Christopher Tilley, site reports alongside contemporary sources relating to the excavations are examined in order to place Mazar’s conclusions into a wider social and archaeological context. Through examination of non-academic texts, such as newspaper interviews with Mazar and her patrons, her use of the biblical narrative, as well as the funding that supports her academic publications, it is the aim of this research to critically analyze Eilat Mazar’s ideological agenda.

As numerous seasons of excavation have yet to provide clear evidence that the structures Mazar has excavated should be attributed to King David of the Old Testament, it must be concluded that the reasons she has made such a declaration depends on arguments outside the archaeological discourse. Discourse analysis has been successfully applied to archaeology in the past in order to address issues that although not directly related to data still impact upon the direction of research. Christopher Tilley’s examination of the Cambridge inaugural lecture in archaeology and Ian Morris’ analysis of Classical archaeology are prime examples.

1A) Discourse Analysis in Archaeology

Morris and Tilley each employ the work of Michel Foucault as Foucault’s approach to studying discourse involves not simply an analysis of the statements made but the institutional and social controls on the production of knowledge. Discourse is therefore held to be a series of institutionally and socially constrained statements made
about a specific topic. Consequently discourse analysis is the process of examining the institutional controls constraining the statements of knowledge made within individual discourses, the ‘principles structuring what utterance may or may not be made’. Foucault posits that every society controls and organizes discourses in different ways, as discourses are linked to topics/objects of knowledge or interest, hence it is the social and institutional controls on the production of knowledge and how it is applied that must be examined rather than the discourse these factors shape.

Foucault’s concept of the *episteme* is also employed by Morris in order to explain changes to Classical Archaeology during the 19th-20th centuries as discussed below. Foucault’s *epistemes*, of which he identifies four in western Europe during the past five hundred years, represent chronological brackets in which concepts such as medicine, psychiatry and archaeology exist but are entirely alien in practice from disciplines of the same name developed in preceding and proceeding *epistemes*. Essentially Morris uses the concept to illustrate that while discourse and knowledge production are subject to institutional controls these constraints are altered over time in response to revolutionary ideas that redefine how concepts (i.e. incarceration, sexuality, archaeology) are understood. The shift in the archaeologies of Greece and Palestine from approaches predominantly guided by textual evidence, Hellenism and Biblical Archaeology respectively, to those principally based on excavated remains both prime examples of such epistemological change.

---

3 Hitchcock 2008, 126.
4 Tilley 1989, 41.
5 Foucault 1981, 52- 53.
7 Morris 1994, 10- 12.
8 Dyson 1989b, 215- 216. See also Morris 1994, 31- 38. The restrictions placed upon Classical archaeologists in 1926 by first the Greek government and then the American School of Classical Studies in Athens (ASCSA) are prime example of such institutional controls.
9 Kuhn 1970, 150.
10 Morris 1994, 11.
1B) Discourse Analysis and the Cambridge Inaugural Lecture in Archaeology.

Through his examination of the Cambridge inaugural lecture in archaeology Christopher Tilley illustrates the applications of discourse analysis for the discipline by discussing not only the arguments or subject matter of each address but also the institutional constraints that shape each lecture’s content. Intended as an initial attempt to instigate a ‘wider programme’ for relating archaeological work to its ‘institutional and social setting’, Tilley highlights the capacity for archaeologists to focus not on the text whether lecture notes or material evidence, but rather the ‘unspoken’ influences upon what is first presented.

While John Disney founded the Cambridge Chair of Archaeology in 1851, Tilley focuses primarily on four of the inaugural lectures given between 1946-1982. By comparing the citations, structure and language used by each new Disney Professor Tilley illustrates how the lectures examined conform to a traditional standard. Tilley shows all four favorably cite prior Disney Professors and extensively make reference to other Cambridge alumni in order to legitimize their own newly appointed status, with discussion of personal achievements limited to prior academic accomplishments and noted associates. That each inaugural lecture is restricted by such demands predetermines and influences the content selected, hence Tilley illustrates that while representing the highest level of achievement within British archaeology, the ‘Disney Professor is not a free agent’ and remains subject to institutional and social constraints.

By analyzing the omissions rather then the explicit content of each of the selected Disney lectures, Tilley reveals the degree to which social and institutional pressures influence archaeological discourse, highlighting the strategic use of citations and

12 Ibid. 41.
13 Ibid. 46-47.
15 Tilley 1989, 52-57.
16 Ibid. 48.
‘prestige tactics’ in archaeological work\textsuperscript{17}. Through investigating the reasons why a point is made rather than the argument the point is making, Tilley shows that the information an author omits can reveal insight into the conclusions they have presented\textsuperscript{18}. Discourse analysis in this instance is able to show that archaeologists are constrained by institutional forces that dictate the direction and focus of their work, while highlighting the need for these same scholars to better scrutinize the constraints imposed by traditional approaches to archaeological discourse.

Following Foucault, who contends that ‘any system of education is a political way of maintaining or modifying the appropriation of discourses’\textsuperscript{19}, by shifting focus from the content of each lecture to why the content was chosen, Tilley is able to show how the behavior of each Disney Professor is influenced by their appointment to the Disney Chair. Furthermore Tilley’s analysis of the Cambridge inaugural lecture in archaeology reveals fresh insight into the text unavailable via a traditional reading of the material, at the very least highlighting the need for further ‘introspection’ in archaeology.

\textbf{1C) The History and Politicization of Early Classical Archaeology}

The study of the discipline of Classical archaeology by Ian Morris is also an example of how discourse analysis can be applied to archaeology in order to discuss aspects of the discipline traditionally overlooked. Specifically addressing the ‘lack of concern’ Classical archaeologists have with the ‘intellectual history of their own practices’\textsuperscript{20}, Morris instead analyses this history in order to reveal the scholastic constraints and effects these limits have had upon the formation of the discipline. Where Tilley focuses on what the texts he analyzed included and excluded to highlight social constraints to discourse, Morris instead examines the social context within which Classical archaeology developed, suggesting that political, social and ideological pressures played an important part in shaping the field.

\textsuperscript{17} Tilley 1990, 127- 152. See also Hutson 2006, 1- 18.
\textsuperscript{18} Tilley 1989, 43.
\textsuperscript{19} Foucault 1981, 64.
\textsuperscript{20} Morris 1994, 8.
Using the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA) as his principal example, Morris shows how the ideologies of foreign educational institutions, influenced the research of archaeologists working within Greece during the late 19th century\(^{21}\). Following the Schools founding in 1881, in part to provide support for American scholars equivalent to that of their French and German rivals\(^{22}\), archaeology within Greece during this period was also constrained by the politicization and control of both the content and direction of the discipline. In 1928 for instance the Greek government dictated that all subsequent archaeological work within Greece by foreigners must first win approval from their patron institution in Athens, a restriction the American School reacted to in December of the same year by forbidding collaborative work by American scholars with their Greek counterparts without the School’s prior permission\(^{23}\).

As a similar situation arose in Palestine during the late 19th- early 20th century, with foreign institutions headquartered within Jerusalem in a similar manner to those established in Athens, many of the problems concerning finance and the politicization of archaeology in Greece mirror those faced by their Palestinian counterparts\(^{24}\). The importance of private funding to the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, exemplified by the institute’s lack of projects during the 1940s following the death of Sir Robert Mond, the School’s ‘founding and principle benefactor’\(^{25}\), parallels a similar dependence upon donations by the ASCSA\(^{26}\); the later securing the right to excavate the Agora in 1927 only after a $250,000 donation from John D. Rockefeller\(^{27}\).

Aside from the influence funding and international scholastic competition had upon the formation of both disciplines, the methodological roots of both Classical archaeology and the archaeology of Israel are also similar. For instance Morris highlights

---


\(^{22}\) Norton 1900, 5.

\(^{23}\) Morris 1994, 35.

\(^{24}\) Lord 1947, 59. See also Clogg 1986a, 90- 93.


\(^{26}\) Sheftel 1979, 7- 8. See also Lord 1947, 58- 62.

\(^{27}\) Morris 1994, 35.
the emphasis Classical archaeology places upon the textual evidence, also an ever-present factor in excavations across the Near East. Referring to what Hayden White terms ‘prefiguring’, an act preceding study where the scholar ‘creates his object of analysis’ and strategies for explaining it, Morris shows how Classical archaeologists have tended to use classical texts in narrativizing their interpretation of material evidence, just as the biblical narrative remains an influential source for the interpretation of finds in Israel as well as much of the Near East.

Both Tilley and Morris effectively employ what Foucault refers to as ‘archaeology’ to analyze their respective topics, examining the ‘vertical linkages’ between different forms of discourse relating to a topic rather then solely the arguments of a single discipline (‘horizontal linkages’). Just as Foucault used a myriad of popular media coupled with academic sources to examine the topics he discusses, Morris cites non-archaeological evidence, including Presidential decrees and Greek law statutes, to build his case, while such an approach has seen Tilley suggest a rewriting of ‘archaeology’s history’, as the ‘kind of framework which Foucault is criticizing has totally dominated all work in archaeology which has dealt with the history of the discipline’.

1D) Discourse Analysis and the Palace of King David

Just as Tilley and Morris examined their respective topics ‘vertically’, employing archaeology as a metaphor as defined by Foucault, discourse analysis is likewise the best means of exploring why Eilat Mazar has chosen to focus on certain aspects of her excavations rather then others. As a result the social, political and institutional influences and ideologies that shape a site report are as important as the data published, hence Mazar’s work is analyzed as much for what it can reveal about her interpretation of the

---

31 Killebrew & Vaughn 2003, 1-10.
32 Ibid, 10.
33 Morris 1994, 238.
34 Tilley 1990, 292.
past as for what it may reveal about the ‘sociopolitical context of the production of archaeological knowledge in the present’.

Following Tilley, who declares that ‘discourse is to be studied in relation to power, as a form of power and as a way of creating and maintaining social divisions’, those responsible for financing Mazar’s work will also be analyzed and discussed, for although often acknowledged the influence patronage and funding has in directing the course of excavations is rarely explored. Although several individuals are listed as supporters of her work it is specifically the Shalem Center, Mazar’s primary source of funding, and the Ir David Foundation, a patron and owner of the land excavated, that will be of primary concern to this research, particularly as it was not until Mazar became a member of the former that funding for her work was made available.

With recent calls for an examination of the media coverage surrounding Eilat Mazar’s excavations, analysis of scholarly publications as well as popular media sources such as newspaper articles, interviews and radio reports have all been included in order to better understand the wider influences affecting the academic results. As an example, following Bell who both argues that ‘opinion’ or ‘op-ed’ pieces are the best means of revealing an author’s ideology, articles published by senior members of the Shalem Center will be discussed in order to highlight the politics of Mazar’s patrons, information that traditionally is not presented in an archeological text.

And while material evidence is vital to any archaeological work rather than simply discussing Mazar’s excavations and the results she employs to build her case, reports from previous excavators as well as commentary from current experts in the field are also to be presented. Examining Mazar’s reports in isolation and for their content alone provides only a fraction of the theories presented regarding archaeology at the ‘City of David’, hence while Mazar’s work on the site is the most recent contribution to the

35 Tilley 1989, 41.
36 Ibid, 45.
37 E. Mazar 2006, 21.
discussion, the discourse surrounding her finds is comprised of many other voices. As excavations conducted at sites across Israel continue to fuel debate concerning the historicity of the biblical narrative, it remains true that while individual discourse ends, discourse itself does not.\(^{40}\)

Alongside Mazar’s excavations and the material evidence she employs to support her case for uncovering King David’s Palace, an examination of the methodological approach Mazar takes toward the archaeological records is important to understanding her conclusions. Just as there is little detail provided about her sources of funding, Mazar also omits any discussion of her ideological stance from her publications, as in her opinion the biblical narrative is an accurate and reliable text, its historicity beyond reproach.

Mazar’s publications on the ‘City of David’, whether academic or public in nature, omit discussion of recent debates surrounding the historicity of the biblical narrative, for to do otherwise would severely limit the textual evidence available to support her identification of King David’s Palace. Essentially the discourse, both popular and academic, surrounding Mazar’s findings will be analyzed, not simply to highlight the omissions she has made but to further explore the reasons why some information was included and other relevant facts were not. Through traditional archaeological texts, such as site reports and journal articles, as well as newspaper and other popular media, Mazar’s excavations will be examined from a variety of perspectives to ultimately reveal why, when only foundations without associated pottery have been recovered from the site, Mazar has proclaimed to have found the Palace of King David.

Discourse analysis serves as a powerful tool for investigating these topics, as once data and site reports are no longer the sole focus of discussion evidence traditionally excluded from the archaeological discourse becomes equally important. By exploring non-scholarly factors peripheral yet influential to archaeological research the excavations by Eilat Mazar will be discussed not exclusively through her reports but via an

\(^{40}\) Tilley 1989, 42.
examination of the discourse, past and present, relating to the site. Following Tilley, Morris and Foucault, what has been omitted from the academic discourse thus far shall be used to supplement that which has been published and publicly highlighted, all in an attempt to provide a more complete understanding of the archaeological discoveries and interpretations of Eilat Mazar.
Chapter Two

Examining the Archaeology and Excavations of the ‘City of David’ from 1864-2005.

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the numerous excavations of the so-called ‘City of David’ in order to provide context for recent conclusions published by Eilat Mazar regarding her discovery of King David’s Palace. By examining the results of archaeologists from 1864 through to those of the past decade, the genealogy and results of the ‘City of David’ excavations will be presented. In addition the sources of funding for these projects will briefly be discussed in order to highlight the varying degrees of influence patronage has had upon the results of excavators, concluding with an examination of several recent arguments reviewing the archaeology of the site. Essentially this chapter aims to provide a review of each excavator’s publications, site reports and other literature relating to excavation of the ‘City of David’, specifically those concerning the area Eilat Mazar claims contain the remains of King David’s Palace.

2A) The Geography and Layout of the ‘City of David’

The ‘City of David’ during the 10th Century BCE covered a number of spurs and hills in a geological ‘saddle’ between the Judaean mountains to the south and the higher Ephraim Mountains to the north (Fig. 1). Bordered by the Kidron Valley to the east and the Tyropoeon Valley to the west, the confluence of these two valleys marks the most southerly tip of the ‘City of David’ ridge. To the north the limits of ancient Jerusalem are harder to define, with no ‘clear-cut topographical demarcation’, but providing a natural border or defensive advantage. The Gihon Spring, Jerusalem’s primary water supply prior to the invention of lime mortar cisterns, surfaces in a cave at the foot of the ridge’s eastern slope and provides a perennial source of water for the irrigation of

---

41 Macalister 1906, 98.
42 Kenyon 1974, 37.
43 Stern 1993, 701.
44 Kenyon 1965, 36.
orchards and agricultural land\textsuperscript{45}. The ‘City of David’ site is located south of the Haram al-Sharif (also referred to as the Temple Mount), just outside the ‘Dung Gate’ and the walls of the Old City, north of the predominantly Palestinian village of Silwan; the Mount of Olives runs parallel to it upon the opposite slope of the Kidron Valley\textsuperscript{46}.

Apart from the naturally defensible position upon a ridge bordered by valleys on all but one side, access to the Gihon Spring was a major factor in encouraging permanent settlement in Jerusalem\textsuperscript{47}. The ‘City of David’ up until at least the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE was ‘confined to the narrow, isolated south-eastern hill\textsuperscript{48}, and although earlier dates for the settlement’s expansion have been proposed, excavations by Avigad in 1967 on the ridge directly west of the ‘City of David’ have shown that walls were not constructed here until the late 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{49}.

Economic factors may also have influenced the site chosen for ancient Jerusalem, with Middle Bronze IIB finds suggesting that from at least this period the settlement acted as a centre for trade. Of the 531 rim sherds dated to 1800 BCE recovered during Kathleen Kenyon’s excavations (1961-1967), over half (67\%) were attributed to storage jars with only 24 from cooking pots, suggesting a predominantly economic or bureaucratic rather than residential function for the settlement\textsuperscript{50}. Likewise Jerusalem’s position at the northern end of the north-south trade route from which vital roads led out in various directions to the east, north and west, made it an ideal site for settlement\textsuperscript{51}. The significance of controlling access to the site, particularly the Gihon Spring, is also exemplified by the construction of the settlement’s earliest fortifications during the Middle Bronze IIB\textsuperscript{52}, fortifications that were maintained and continued to define ancient

\textsuperscript{45} E. Mazar 1997, 52.
\textsuperscript{46} Reich, Gideon & Winter 1999, 46.
\textsuperscript{47} Stern 1993, 701.
\textsuperscript{48} Wightman 1993, 1.
\textsuperscript{49} Avigad 1983, 55. See also E. Mazar & B. Mazar 1989.
\textsuperscript{50} Steiner 2001, 23.
\textsuperscript{51} Dorsey 1991, 124.
\textsuperscript{52} Shiloh 1984, 12. See also Kenyon 1974, 78; Reich 1987, 163-164; Cahill 2003, 21 and Steiner 2001, 21.
Jerusalem until the occupation of the western ridge during the reign of Hezekiah (715-686 BCE)\textsuperscript{53}.

The population and size of Jerusalem during the 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE is currently indeterminable, with the number of residents the settlement could support ranging from a maximum of 2,000 to just over half this total\textsuperscript{54}. If the expansion of the settlement north is held to have occurred during the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, it is estimated that the ‘City of David’ would have covered no more then between 12 and 13 hectares, its size limited by the site’s geography. This total does not take into account the extra space (200 sq. m) added to the ridge by a series of terraces employed to increase the settlement’s size, the earliest examples of this architectural feature at the ‘City of David’ is dated to no later than the 12\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{55}. Contemporary examples of terraces in the central hill country have been recorded from as early as the Middle Bronze Age\textsuperscript{56}.

\textbf{2B) Early Campaigns and the Work of Duncan and Macalister (1923–1925)}

Excavation of the ‘City of David’ began with the work of Sir Charles Warren (1865-1867), a member of the Royal Engineers who excavated a tunnel connecting the eastern slope with the Gihon Spring, a natural well henceforth known as ‘Warren’s Shaft’\textsuperscript{57}. Receiving funding from the Palestinian Exploration Fund (\textit{PEF}), a London based organization founded to ‘contribute to the elucidation of biblical problems’\textsuperscript{58} Warren’s project was plagued by financial difficulties from the onset\textsuperscript{59}. Notwithstanding initial enthusiasm for the Jerusalem excavations, with Queen Victoria personally contributing £100 to the cause, the \textit{PEF} relied upon subscribers to finance their projects, and despite having 272 eager attendees at their inaugural meeting, the shortage of funds

\textsuperscript{53} Thiele 1983, 217. See also Avigad & Giva 2000.
\textsuperscript{54} Steiner 2001, 52. See also Broshi, 1975 5- 14; Broshi & Gophna 1986, 73- 90 and Shiloh 1980, 25- 35.
\textsuperscript{55} Steiner 2001, 37.
\textsuperscript{56} Finkelstein 1988, 309.
\textsuperscript{57} Steiner 2001, 21. See also Warren 1876.
\textsuperscript{58} Silberman 1982, 86- 87.
\textsuperscript{59} Macalister 1925, 31.
was blamed in large part on the ‘lack of spectacular finds that had been expected in the first flush of enthusiasm’\textsuperscript{60}.

It was not until 1921 and the project led by Garrow Duncan and Roger Stewart Alexander Macalister (1923-1925) that extensive digging at the area later excavated by Eilat Mazar was first undertaken. As they had with Warren’s expedition, the PEF funded Duncan and Macalister’s excavations, the latter having been made director of excavations for the PEF in Palestine following the retirement of Fredrick Bliss in 1901\textsuperscript{61}. In fact it was from his time working with Bliss at Tell el-Hesi (1898-1900) that Macalister first employed a stratigraphical approach, a practice he adopted for his later career, including his excavations at the ‘City of David’\textsuperscript{62}. Although their approach to the site has since been criticized by numerous scholars\textsuperscript{63}, particularly their inability to ‘adapt their techniques to the hilly conditions’\textsuperscript{64}, Duncan and Macalister’s work nonetheless provides the earliest archaeological record of the area recently excavated by Eilat Mazar.

Including an area of more than 3000 sq. m, Duncan and Macalister cleared to bedrock a large part of the summit above the Gihon Spring and across the ‘City of David’ ridge to the western slope, ultimately uncovering structures and walls that they believed to represent the settlement’s earliest fortifications\textsuperscript{65}. Among these finds, located within their Field 5 upon the summit of the eastern slope above the Gihon Spring, Duncan and Macalister excavated the upper part of a stone glacis that they interpreted as being pre-Israelite, dubbing this terraced construction the ‘Jebusite Ramp’\textsuperscript{66}. Flanking the glacis, Duncan and Macalister also uncovered two large, square towers, dating the northern structure to the Hasmonean period (ca. 167-37 BCE) and its southern counterpart to ca. 1000 BCE. The later they referred to as the ‘Tower of David’\textsuperscript{67} on account of the date
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attributed to its construction as well as their supposition based on biblical accounts that King David ruled from Jerusalem during this period.\footnote{Duncan & Macalister 1926, 49.}

To the north of their Field 5, Duncan and Macalister largely exposed the entire area down to bedrock, recording numerous artifacts they attributed to the Iron IIB (ca. 923-550 BCE). Consisting of pottery, seal impressions and figurines typical of the period, unique amongst the finds was a near intact Hebrew ostracon.\footnote{Ibid. 179-191.} Duncan and Macalister also published conclusions regarding walls uncovered in Field 5 that they again dated to the Iron Age I (ca. 1200-1000 BCE), attributing to the Jebusites a double line of walls with towers facing outward to the north. These structures extended across from the ridge’s west to the ‘Jebusite Ramp’ in the east and were interpreted as representing the ‘City of David’s’ earliest and most northerly fortification line.\footnote{Heffner 1925, 334. See also Duncan & Macalister 1926, 15.} Although not utilizing the strategic advantages of the ridge’s summit, Duncan and Macalister concluded that the fortifications were built just below this point because of a geographical feature they referred to as the ‘Zedek Valley’, a depression in the ridge that although filled with many boulders limited the defensibility of the site’s highest point.\footnote{Duncan & Macalister 1926, 15.}

Duncan and Macalister also recorded evidence of early cisterns and a ritual bath (\textit{miqveh}) beneath a structure dating to the Second Temple Period (ca. 536 BCE-70 CE),\footnote{Ibid. 93-96} with these water installations the primary finds attributed to the Second Temple Period occupation of the ‘City of David’.\footnote{Much of the portable physical evidence was consigned to and remains preserved by Kenyon’s PEF sponsors. See Kenyon 1974, 78.} Finally, as a large part of the northern portion of Field 5, including the buildings containing the cisterns and \textit{miqveh}, were sealed over by a Byzantine structure dating to between the 4\textsuperscript{th}/7\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE, Duncan and Macalister were also careful to excavate and record this feature. Referring to the structure as the ‘House of Eusebius’ following the discovery of this name upon a drain tile within the
building, it is similar in design and construction to contemporary Byzantine homes excavated by B. and E. Mazar.\(^{74}\)

In addition to providing the first comprehensive excavations of the ‘City of David’, Duncan and Macalister’s campaign also offers insight into their approach to the Bible and its relationship to archaeology. The ‘Jebusite Ramp’ and the ‘Tower of David’ for example were named because the excavators had attributed both to the late 11\(^{th}\)/ early 10\(^{th}\) century BCE and therefore associated these structures with what they considered to be the facts as presented in the biblical narrative. And while their sponsor the PEF was publicly espoused as being ‘not committed to any form of dogma’\(^{75}\), it was clear from the initial reaction to Sir Charles Warren’s work that evidence to support the Bible would be looked upon favorably by the PEF membership.


Working with support from both the British School of Archaeology and their associates the PEF, Dame Kathleen Kenyon’s excavations (1961-1967) challenged the conclusions presented by Duncan and Macalister regarding their dating of the northern fortifications and those along the eastern ridge above the Gihon Spring. Kenyon aimed to show that the Jerusalem of 1000 BCE extended further down the eastern ridge toward the Gihon Spring, encompassing ‘Warren’s Shaft’ and providing secure access to water during times of siege.\(^{76}\)

Initially working within Duncan and Macalister’s Field 5, Kenyon began her excavations at the ‘Tower of David’ (Site A). Running at a 45\(^{o}\) angle from the base of the structure down the eastern slope to just above the Gihon Spring, Kenyon’s Trench 1 was ‘laid out in squares of five meters, two squares wide, seven squares in extent’.\(^{77}\) In the lowest square of Trench 1, a wall (Wall NB) was unearthed measuring two meters both in
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width and height, with Kenyon ultimately excavating sixteen meters of the structure following extensions of Trench 1 to the south in 1962 and 1967 \(^{78}\) (Fig. 1).

Built at the foot of a rock scarp upon the eastern slope, Kenyon discovered that beneath Wall NB there was a ‘clear foundation trench’ containing pottery sherds that were ‘unmistakably Middle Bronze II’, ultimately leading her to conclude that Wall NB was likely erected during the 18\(^{th}\) century BCE \(^{79}\). By successfully dating Wall NB to the Middle Bronze Age, Kenyon showed that ‘Warren’s Shaft’ lay within the walls of ancient Jerusalem and that the structures excavated by Duncan and Macalister upon the eastern summit were not the earliest fortifications built upon the ridge of the ‘City of David’ \(^{80}\).

Considering Duncan and Macalister dating of the ‘Tower of David’ and the adjacent fortification line were now contested, Kenyon endeavored to accurately date the construction of these structures. From the evidence recorded from Trench 1, it was revealed that the ‘Tower of David’ had been constructed upon the ‘ruins of earlier buildings’ adjoining a ‘complex surviving to the east of the tower’, discoveries which led Kenyon to suggest the tower was built no earlier the 7\(^{th}\) century BCE \(^{81}\). In fact, based on pottery sherds and coins dated to the 2\(^{nd}\) century BCE later recovered from beneath the ‘Tower of David’, Kenyon concluded that the structure was ‘certainly Maccabean’ \(^{82}\).

Extending her Site A another 50m north along the eastern summit of the ‘City of David’ ridge, Kenyon determined that the ‘Jebusite Ramp’ was not the earliest of the fortifications excavated by her predecessors. Covered by Squares A1- A3 and Square 23, excavations revealed that a smaller tower Duncan and Macalister dated to the Hasmonean Period (ca. 167- 37 BCE) \(^{83}\) was built against a wall Kenyon had earlier attributed to Nehemiah (ca. 440 BCE) \(^{84}\). As further excavation also showed that the tower was built upon a midden deposit containing pottery from the 4\(^{th}\)/5\(^{th}\) centuries BCE, Kenyon
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concluded that this fortification predated both the ‘Jebusite Ramp’ and the ‘Tower of David’\textsuperscript{85}.

Concerning the ‘Jebusite Ramp’ Kenyon proposed the terraced structure was not a ‘convenient stairway’ but instead the ‘buttressing of a weak point in the defenses’, suggesting it was constructed prior to the adjacent ‘Tower of David’\textsuperscript{86}. Kenyon therefore concluded that ‘all the constructions following the line of the eastern crest of the eastern ridge belong to the post-Exilic-Hellenistic-Maccabean period\textsuperscript{87}. Square XVIII, immediately north of the ‘Jebusite Ramp’ and below the eastern ridge, produced evidence of broken ashlar masonry. This included a Proto-Aeolic capital that Kenyon dated to no later than the 5th-3rd centuries BCE, suggesting that ‘during the period of monarchic Jerusalem, a building of some considerable pretension stood on top of the scarp\textsuperscript{88}.

Based on evidence from her Site A24, situated just below the crest of the eastern slope, the projected length and angle of Wall NB led Kenyon to believe that the northern fortifications were positioned further along the ‘City of David’ ridge then Duncan and Macalister had first proposed\textsuperscript{89}. Cut across the width of the ridge’s narrowest constriction, Kenyon’s Site H produced evidence of a ‘casement wall’ dating to the 10th/9th century BCE, the earliest fortifications thus far recorded from this excavation area\textsuperscript{90}. In fact, at Site H, Kenyon notes that the ‘trench coincided almost exactly with the lines of the Bronze and Early Iron Age fortifications’ further to the south\textsuperscript{91}. Founded on bedrock, the 10th/9th century BCE ‘casement wall’ excavated at Site H was composed of ‘enormous, almost megalithic blocks… surviving in places to a height of two courses’\textsuperscript{92}, reinforcing the possibility that this was a fortification to secure the weak northern end of the ridge.

\textsuperscript{85} Kenyon, 1964, 45.  
\textsuperscript{86} Kenyon 1974, 192-194.  
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid. 77.  
\textsuperscript{88} Kenyon 1963, 16  
\textsuperscript{89} Duncan & Macalister 1926, 15.  
\textsuperscript{90} Kenyon 1974, 114-115.  
\textsuperscript{91} Kenyon 1965, 9.  
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid, 17.
As the first ‘reasonably intact foundations’ (Site A24) to be excavated north of Site H were those of two buildings built upon manmade terraces Kenyon dated to the 7th century BCE, no proof of expansion beyond the Site H ‘casement wall’ prior to this date was recorded by Kenyon. Kenyon also revealed that rather than a natural feature as Duncan and Macalister had proposed, the ‘Zedek Valley’ was more likely the remnants of a quarry, with the bedrock at this point continuing to rise toward the north rather then running east-west as does the ‘Valley’.

Kenyon also uncovered data from two deposits to support her theory that a fortification contemporary and possibly connected to Wall NB ran along the northern limits of the settlement. According to Kenyon, accumulation of debris at Site H to the south of the casement wall ‘showed that the earliest occupation here was about the 10th century BCE’, a conclusion supported by finds from Site A24 to the northeast. Yet when compared to finds excavated from Site P, situated immediately west of the post-Exilic fortifications along the eastern summit, the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age material uncovered are shown to be ‘absolutely distinct’ from what was found in the earliest deposits to the north. This led Kenyon to conclude that the ‘walls along the south side of Site H must have constituted the boundary of the earliest Jerusalem’.

Unfortunately excavations aimed at determining the juncture of the northwestern corner of the ancient city, as well as the western fortification line, revealed little to confirm or deny the existence of fortifications contemporary to those from Kenyon’s Trench 1. Digging directly opposite Site H, west of a modern road and ‘slightly below the present crest of the eastern ridge’, Kenyon’s Sites K, N and M ‘produced no evidence at all of Bronze Age or Iron Age occupation’, suggesting that Jerusalem did not spread into the western ridge until a comparatively late date. Although Site K has revealed ‘some Iron Age pottery’ near the crest of the summit, as yet ‘no structures or occupations levels’ have been exposed, leading Kenyon and others to conclude that the northwestern corner
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of the Middle Bronze Age town underlies the street just east of Site M and directly west of Site H, and that it is ‘fair to assume that the Middle Bronze Age wall ran along the upper scarp’\(^98\).

Kathleen Kenyon’s career as an archaeologist at various sites across Israel, including Jericho, Samaria and Jerusalem\(^99\), typifies the shift away from employing the Bible as the dominant guide and interpretive model for directing excavation in the Holy Land\(^100\). Instead Kenyon strove to employ a more ‘scientific’ and unbiased approach by taking the ‘biblical evidence mostly at face value’ and instead placing the emphasis on what the material evidence revealed\(^101\). Rather than allow the text to dictate the direction of her work from the onset, Kenyon frequently attributed structures to biblical figures only after she had firmly dated these features to a specific period\(^102\), Nehemiah’s wall on the eastern scarp\(^103\) and the ‘Solomonic’ casement wall in her Site H\(^104\) both prime examples. Although Kenyon’s work at the ‘City of David’ has been challenged, often successfully, her conclusions regarding the settlement’s fortifications during the Middle Bronze Age through to the time of Nehemiah remain widely accepted by most archaeologists working within Israel\(^105\).

2D) Yigal Shiloh’s Excavations at the City of David (1978-1982)

Leading his project on behalf of ‘The City of David Society’, an organization dedicated to supporting the investigation and study of the City of David\(^106\). Yigal Shiloh (1978-1982) investigated the entire south-eastern hill’, with approximately 3,000 sq. m. cleared in five seasons\(^107\) (Fig. 2). Essentially the aim of Shiloh’s excavations was to
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further examine the areas above the Gihon Spring by expanding on the prior work of Kenyon\textsuperscript{108}. For example, Shiloh’s discovery of an 18\textsuperscript{th} century BCE fortification south of Kenyon’s Trench 1\textsuperscript{109} helped validate Kenyon’s conclusions regarding Wall NB by showing another Middle Bronze Age structure of similar dimensions, running along the same north- south contour\textsuperscript{110}.

In regards to the area subsequently excavated by Eilat Mazar (2005- 2007), the site covered by Duncan and Macalister’s Field 5 and Kenyon’s Site H, Shiloh’s Area G provides evidence ranging from the 14\textsuperscript{th}/13\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE to the Hasmonean period (ca. 167- 37 BCE)\textsuperscript{111}. Covering approximately 475 sq. m. and subsequently divided into areas labeled Squares A- E 2- 6, finds from the 14\textsuperscript{th}- 13\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, the earliest remains recorded by Shiloh from Area G, spread across 200 sq. m. and formed a ‘massive substructure’ that extended beyond the natural topography of the ridge, ultimately forming two terraces, one above the other.

Preserved to a height of 5- 6 m. on the upper terrace, these supporting walls were built in a similar manner to those on the lower terrace, the latter measuring only 3- 5 m. in height, with both having been ‘integrated with the stone and earth fill’\textsuperscript{112}. Although Kenyon had previously excavated the walls and terraces within the southern half of Area G, attributing their construction to the 14\textsuperscript{th}/13\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE\textsuperscript{113}, pottery sherds from the stone fills of the substructure recorded by Shiloh show that it was built no earlier than the 13\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{114}.

Although all prior excavators of Area G provide dates for the construction of Duncan and Macalister’s ‘Jebusite Ramp’\textsuperscript{115}, evidence recovered by Shiloh, who renamed it the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’, shows that this terrace structure represents
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more than one stage of building activity. Rising to a height of 18 m. and covered by a thick glacis, this imposing architectural feature’s terraced form indicates that its primary function was technical rather than defensive, possibly built to reinforce the ridge for construction above. Distinguishable by the size and orientation of the blocks used to construct each portion of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’, Shiloh concludes that at least two distinct periods of development can be seen.

Shiloh revealed that the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ is composed of 55 ‘steps’, with the lowest 15 constructed of stones averaging 30 x 30/40 cm. whilst the 40 upper ‘steps’ are built of ‘particularly large limestone blocks’, measuring 50 x 50/30 cm. The discovery of the larger blocks atop the smaller stones indicates that the upper portion of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ was a later addition, as this method of erecting terrace retaining walls runs contrary to other contemporary examples, the stairwell retaining wall of the Tel Beer Sheba water system a prime example.

Although the lower half of the ‘Structure’ was built atop the remnants of the two 13th century BCE terraces, the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ almost entirely covering the earlier remains, Shiloh also revealed evidence from Squares B5-C5 upon the lower terrace that indicated the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ in rare instances incorporated the walls of the substructure rather than simply employing the stone and earth fills as a stable foundation. Therefore Shiloh was able to limit the construction date of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ to after the completion of the two 13th-century BCE terraces it was built upon and utilized for support. Shiloh also showed that the ‘Tower of David’ unearthed by Duncan and Macalister ‘integrated the top of the Stepped Stone Structure’ into it. Hence by confirming Kenyon’s attribution of the fortification above and integrated with the
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upper portion of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ to the Hasmonean Era (ca. 167-37 BCE)\textsuperscript{123}, Shiloh concluded that this section of the ‘Structure’ was built no later then the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE\textsuperscript{124}.

In order to define the exact construction dates of the two parts of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’, Shiloh excavated three houses similar in design to those uncovered in Kenyon’s Square A24 upon the northeastern slope\textsuperscript{125}. Constructed upon two terraces adjacent to the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’, the ‘Burnt Room House’ and the ‘House of Ahiel’ are 8\textsuperscript{th}/7\textsuperscript{th} century structures\textsuperscript{126} erected upon the larger, upper terrace, roughly 12 m. wide and 27 m. long, whilst the ‘House of the Bullae’ sat on a terrace 5 m. below\textsuperscript{127}. Dubbed the ‘House of Ahiel’ due to this name appearing upon a pair of ostraca connected to the building, Shiloh recorded over 37 jars from the building (Locus 790), dating them to approximately the end of the Iron Age\textsuperscript{128}.

The ‘House of the Bullae’ revealed numerous finds with the discovery of 45 bullae (seal impressions) the most significant. One seal (G.11601) is even believed to bear the name ‘Germaryahu son of Shaphan’\textsuperscript{129}, possibly a reference to a courtier from the Book of Jeremiah (36: 10-12, 25)\textsuperscript{130}, while the presence of these bullae implies that by at least the 7\textsuperscript{th} century an administration requiring records, literacy and a bureaucracy had begun to develop\textsuperscript{131}. The presence of so many seal impressions in one excavation area also suggests a function for the ‘House of the Bullae’, for it may have served as an ‘archive or public office’\textsuperscript{132}.
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Coupled with evidence obtained from Squares D5-E5\textsuperscript{133}, located east of the city wall and outside the fortified settlement, Shiloh confirmed Kenyon’s conclusion that expansion beyond the original limits of Jerusalem had occurred across the ‘City of David’ ridge during the 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{134}. In addition, with Iron Age II pottery recovered from the destruction layer of the ‘Burnt Room House’ Shiloh had also found proof that terraces and buildings were continuing to be employed outside the city limits well into the 7\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{135}. As Shiloh also showed that the lower floors of the ‘Burnt Room House’ were built over the bottom half of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ it is now possible to roughly date the two parts of the terrace. The lower portion was constructed between the 13\textsuperscript{th} and 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE while the upper layer was built no earlier than the demolition of the ‘Burnt Room House’ in the late 7\textsuperscript{th} century BCE and no later than the Hasmonean Period (ca. 167-37 BCE), as the top of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ was incorporated into the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE fortifications\textsuperscript{136}.

Ultimately Yigal Shiloh’s excavations reveal much that was previously unknown regarding the ‘City of David’, particularly the composition and dating of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’, however, his work also served to reassess the excavations and conclusions of previous projects, particularly those led by Kathleen Kenyon. Area G, for instance, revealed further examples of the ashlar masonry while Shiloh separately published an examination the Proto-Aeolic capital recovered from Kenyon’s Square 23\textsuperscript{137}, ultimately attributing it to the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE based on its style and previously recorded capitals\textsuperscript{138}. Measuring over 1.2 m. wide, 60 cm. high and nearly 46 cm. thick, Shiloh described the find as the ‘finest of all the proto-Aeolic capitals in this country’, comparing it to previously excavated examples from Ramat Rachel, Samaria and Megiddo\textsuperscript{139}.
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Through extensive excavation of the ‘City of David’ Yigal Shiloh succeeded in his goal of ‘clarifying and confirming’ the work of Kenyon, ultimately supporting her assessment that the site provided little evidence of 10th century BCE occupation. In contrast to the views of his patrons the ‘City of David Society’, who promote King David and the United Monarchy as historical fact, Shiloh confirmed Kenyon’s assessment that during the Iron IIA the size of the settlement would have been small. As a result both excavators concluded that if King David did have a palace built for him by King Hiram of Tyre (2 Samuel 5:11) within the fortified settlement it would not have been as grand as the structure the Bible describes\textsuperscript{140}.

In addition, no evidence of a court bureaucracy was recovered from prior to the 7th century BCE, suggesting that Jerusalem was the center of a kingdom as indicated in the biblical narrative until after the time of attributed to David. Therefore, coupled together, the work of Shiloh and Kenyon has arguably contributed more to our understanding of the city’s early history then all the other excavations combined\textsuperscript{141}.

\textbf{2E) Recent Research and Commentary Pertaining to the City of David}

Over the past decade several archaeologists, who despite not having personally excavated at the ‘City of David’, have written important publications offering fresh insights into the data recovered by previous campaigns. Steiner and Cahill have edited the final reports of Kenyon and Shiloh’s respectively, while Amihai Mazar, Eilat Mazar’s second cousin, has also reexamined the construction and dating of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ based on both prior campaigns. With a greater number of contemporary excavations to compare data to, as well as modern techniques such as radiocarbon dating (C14), these publications aid significantly in refining and interpreting the conclusions of previous excavations, particularly where final site reports had not been published prior to death of the primary excavator.
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Steiner’s work compiling Kathleen Kenyon’s results, after her death in 1978, were fraught with complications from deciphering her records to issues concerning now missing or unavailable physical evidence. Obstacles aside, Steiner’s publication of Kenyon’s results provides details that largely confirm her conclusions, including a general lack of material evidence from the 10th century BCE. Steiner also confirmed Shiloh’s earlier suggestion that a ‘modern retaining wall’ had been built as a support to Duncan and Macalister’s ‘Tower of David’, noting that ‘parts of the northern ramp had been restored with cement by the Department of Antiquities of Palestine’.

Likewise Steiner supports Kenyon’s hypothesis that Duncan and Macalister’s ‘Zedek Valley’ did not limit the northern fortification line during this period, with further evidence from Kenyon’s Site H confirming her identification of a structure as a 10th/9th century BCE ‘casement wall’. Steiner also presents evidence that suggests the population of the settlement during this time would have been not only limited by space but by the lack of food, with little evidence of nearby agricultural land or practices during the 10th century BCE. Yet considering that Steiner has also revealed Jerusalem was likely an administrative centre from the Middle Bronze II at the earliest, a situation substantiated by contemporary Egyptian sources, trade or taxation may have supplemented traditional means of production.

Concerning Jerusalem’s population during the 10th century BCE, Steiner has also reevaluated Shiloh’s estimates, lowering the total from approximately 5,200 people to no more then 2,000 inhabitants. Following London, Steiner calculates Jerusalem’s population density at 200 persons per hectare rather than Shiloh’s quotient of 450, an
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adjustment that aligns the site with other settlements across Israel\textsuperscript{151}; Marfoe’s study of Early Bronze Age Arad\textsuperscript{152} resulting in a quotient of 200-250 people per ha. while Broshi and Gophna used a quotient of 250 in their study of Middle Bronze II settlements\textsuperscript{153}. Considering Steiner’s calculations more then halves Shiloh’s population estimates, it is unlikely that Jerusalem controlled large parts of Judea during this period, as the agricultural, economic and military capacity of the city at this time would have made such a feat unfeasible\textsuperscript{154}.

Steiner’s suggestion that structures erected during the Middle Bronze II were abandoned prior to the settlement of the ‘City of David’ during the 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{155} runs contra to Kenyon and Shiloh’s results, with both excavators recording the continued use of the 1800 BCE fortifications throughout the 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{156}. In fact the Middle Bronze II, fortifications were shown by both Kenyon and Shiloh to have been employed until at least the Iron Age II, with Kenyon suggesting they were replaced in the 7\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{157} and Shiloh concluding that they survived until the siege of Jerusalem in 586 BCE\textsuperscript{158}.

Ronnie Reich and Eli Shukron have also revealed architectural features at the ‘City of David’ that further reinforce arguments for continuous habitation and fortification from at least the Middle Bronze Age. The excavators highlight the construction of Channel II, also known as the Siloam Channel\textsuperscript{159}, as evidence of the continuing importance of Middle Bronze Age engineering throughout the Iron Age, with Channel II serving to move water down from the Gihon Spring to agricultural land in the Kidron valley and ultimately a pool situated at the confluence of the Kidron and
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Tyropoeon Valleys\textsuperscript{160}. Reich and Shukron have also attributed two towers surrounding the Gihon Spring to the Middle Bronze Age, with stratigraphic evidence showing the fortifications preceding the development of Channel II\textsuperscript{161}. Hence the continued use of Channel II until at least the 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE and the construction of Hezekiah’s Tunnel is further proof that the site was occupied throughout the 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{162}.

Cahill’s work compiling and examining the data from Yigal Shiloh’s campaigns following his death in 1982 also yields few examples of 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE material evidence, the sherds dated to this period recovered from the lower floor of the ‘Burnt Room House’\textsuperscript{163} and Shiloh’s Areas B, D and E. In Area E1, Shiloh’s excavation of a ‘multieroom building with pebble floors’ that yielded vessels both unslipped and hand-burnished, and red slipped and hand-burnished, is compared by Cahill to pottery from Arad XII\textsuperscript{164}. As Israel Finkelstein has declared that this stratum may represent the only reliable 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE layer in the entire country\textsuperscript{165}, Cahill therefore concludes that Areas E1 and E3 to the north are evidence of early Iron Age occupation of the ‘City of David’. Area D1 also revealed similar evidence of 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE occupation, including two layers of fill and a clay oven, while in Area B directly to the east a series of walls was also attributed to this period\textsuperscript{166}.

\textit{Contra} to Shiloh’s attribution of the ‘Burnt Room House’ to the 7\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{167}, Cahill highlights the recovery from the earliest floor surface of the house fragments from a Phoenician bichrome flask and an assemblage of unslipped and red-slipped, hand-burnished local pottery to ascribe the structure to the 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{168}. Cahill argues that these Iron IIA finds cast doubt upon Shiloh’s 7\textsuperscript{th} century BCE dating of the upper portion of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’, as Shiloh had argued that the ‘Burnt
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Room House’ was built over the lower half of the terrace\textsuperscript{169}. Cahill therefore suggests that based on the ‘Burnt Room House’ assemblage, coupled with the fact that the latest pottery from the lower courses of the terrace date to the Early Iron Age, the entire ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ was built in a single construction effort, datable to approximately the 12\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{170}.

Although Norma Franklin’s work focuses not on Jerusalem but Megiddo and Samaria, her examination of ‘mason marks’ upon ashlar blocks from both sites aids significantly in dating the Proto Aeolic capitals and ashlar masonry found at the ‘City of David’, as Franklin has shown such marks at indicative of 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE architecture\textsuperscript{171}. Franklin proposes that the walls at both Samaria and Megiddo represent more then one phase of construction, identifying two distinct chronological horizons/layers that she attributes to the 9\textsuperscript{th} and 8\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE respectively. At Megiddo the earlier horizon is labeled by Franklin as ‘Stratum V’ and includes Palace 1723, while Courtyard 1693 and Gate 1567 are attributed to the later 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE ‘Stratum IV’\textsuperscript{172}. Likewise at Samaria Franklin again divides the ‘Omri Palace/ Period I’ between the 9\textsuperscript{th} and 8\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE, concluding that several structures previously labeled ‘Omri Palace/ Period I’ are datable to the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE while ‘Ahab Palace/ Period II’ should be attributed to a later horizon\textsuperscript{173}.

While Franklin clearly identifies the ‘mason’s marks’ found at both sites with the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, supporting Shiloh’s attribution of the Jerusalem ashlers to the same period\textsuperscript{174}, Franklin also attributes several structures comprised of ashlar masonry to the later construction phase\textsuperscript{175}. As a result the construction date of Jerusalem ashlers and associated Proto Aeolic capital should be similarly adjusted to between the 9\textsuperscript{th} and 8\textsuperscript{th}
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century BCE, since prior comparisons between these finds and those from Samaria and Megiddo relied upon the results Franklin has shown require adjustment\textsuperscript{176}.

Although David Ussishkin has argued that the traditional 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE attribution for all structures Franklin assigns to the later horizon at both sites should remain\textsuperscript{177}, Zarzecki-Peleg has independently reached similar conclusions to Franklin regarding Megiddo and the date of Palace 1723 and the surrounding courtyard (1693)\textsuperscript{178}. With regard to the dating of the Jerusalem Proto-Aeolic capital and the accompanying ashlar masonry, Franklin’s reassessment of similar finds at Samaria and Megiddo provides a chronological bracket for when the Jerusalem capital was likely erected. Since none other than Eilat Mazar has yet attributed a Proto-Aeolic capital in Israel to earlier than the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, and given the possibility that buildings dating the 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE at Samaria and Megiddo were also adorned with such capitals, it is between these two eras that the Jerusalem capital was first displayed.

2F) Assessing the Date and Composition of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’

Amihai Mazar’s recent examination of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ has added significantly to our understanding of the construction and dating of this ancient terrace, as he concludes the structure underwent five separate periods of development rather than the two originally proposed by Shiloh\textsuperscript{179}. Attributing each construction phase to one of the five ‘components’, Mazar shows that the remains excavated in Kenyon’s Trench 1, defined by A. Mazar as ‘Components 3, 4 and 5’, form a single unit distinctly separate from ‘Component 2’, the section of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ that extends upward and connects to the Hasmonean fortifications as revealed by Kenyon\textsuperscript{180}.
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Referred to by A. Mazar as the ‘Stepped Stone Mantle’ or the ‘mantle wall’\textsuperscript{181}, this section of the structure is dated to the Iron IIA and was built over but not connected to the lower ‘components’ where Steiner has revealed a number of 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE pottery sherds\textsuperscript{182}. It has also been suggested that the ‘Stepped Stone Mantle’ should be divided again on account of the fact that the lower stones of ‘Component 2’ were placed in a north-south orientation while the blocks above instead run toward the northwest\textsuperscript{183}. Furthermore the fact that the lower stones of ‘Component 2’ are smaller then those placed atop of them again runs contrary to traditional architectural methods and parallels the variation identified by Shiloh that originally led to the suggestion that the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ was not built in a single construction effort.

Alternatively Cahill has presented evidence indicative of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century BCE and linked to the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ to suggest the entire terrace was built during this period and in a single construction effort\textsuperscript{184}. Highlighting pottery recovered from Shiloh’s Squares C5 and B4, including fragments of several collar-neck pithoi\textsuperscript{185}, Cahill argues these finds are ‘diachronic markers’ of the Iron Age I and attributes the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ to this period as a result\textsuperscript{186}. Yet as Steiner admits that there is scarce evidence for occupation of the ‘City of David’ during the transition from Late Bronze Age to the Iron I\textsuperscript{187}, the fact that sherds attributed to the 12\textsuperscript{th} century BCE were discovered either between the stones of ‘Components 3, 4 and 5’ or from the earliest floor layer of the ‘Burnt Room House’, suggest they were not found \textit{in situ}. Recent counter arguments have likewise highlighted the lack of complete vessels from either excavation datable to this period, adding that the sherds recorded from the ‘Burnt Room House’ originated from ten separate loci\textsuperscript{188}, again indicating they were likely transported from elsewhere and recycled in order to create a foundation for later construction.
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Since Steiner and Cahill’s 12th century BCE sherds were all found in at least secondary contexts, providing only the date after which the associated structures could have been built, the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ should be attributed to after the transition from the Late Bronze Age to Iron I. Considering Amihai Mazar’s reassessment of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ it has been shown that the terrace underwent at least three phases of development, with the upper portions of the terrace, the ‘Stepped Stone Mantle’ (‘Component 2’), should not be attributed to the 12th century BCE but rather to between the 7th century BCE, Shiloh’s dating of the ‘Burnt Room House’, and the Hasmonean fortifications built above it.

Conclusions

Based on the finds of Duncan and Macalister, Kathleen Kenyon and Yigal Shiloh, as well as the conclusions of recent scholarship aimed at reassessing the results of these excavations, material evidence for the presence of a 10th century BCE structures in general at the ‘City of David’ remains utterly lacking. Despite the limited structural remains dating to this period, size constraints also suggest Kenyon was correct when she theorized that if such a palace did exist it would have been small, as ‘anything grandiose would have taken up too much space within the restricted area of the Jebusite-Davidic city’. Even if the 12th century BCE terraces excavated by Kenyon and Shiloh remained in use during Iron II the fortified area available for construction still measures only between 12- 13 ha.

While the presence of ashlar masonry and the associated Proto Aeolic capital dated to the 9th century BCE by Shiloh, and more recently to the 8th century BCE by Franklin, certainly implies that at one time an important building, adorned with features iconic of Iron II palatial architecture, was constructed atop the ridge of the ‘City of
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David’, no evidence as yet of a building constructed of such material and dating to the 10th century BCE has been found. Likewise debate continues as to the function and development of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’, with most now agreeing that it was a terrace constructed in at least two phases, the lower courses between the 13th and 7th centuries BCE, the upper courses no earlier than the 7th century BCE but prior to the Hasmonaean fortifications erected above.

Although there remain those who see Jerusalem of the 10th century BCE as little more than an unfortified settlement, evidence presented by Kenyon and Shiloh shows that fortifications dated to the Middle Bronze Age (1800 BCE) were employed up until at least the siege of Nebuchadnezzar in 587 BCE. Coupled with the use of Channel II during approximately the same period194, the importance of these features suggests that a form of central authority or administration oversaw their maintenance, while the number of residential buildings when compared to those serving a bureaucratic function again suggests the settlement acted as an administrative centre during this period195.

In conclusion, after more than a century of excavation at the ‘City of David’, no evidence has been recorded of a building attributed to the 10th century BCE that excavators have deemed to be King David’s Palace. Although all who have published upon the topic have theorized that a building of some importance was constructed upon the ridge above the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’, most suggesting it was likely the ‘Fortress of Zion’, all understand that considering the dearth of evidence to support the existence of such an architectural feature, any conclusions remain improvable conjecture.

Chapter Three
Extra Biblical Evidence for the Existence of King David

Considering the lack of both architectural and artifactual material evidence attesting to the reign of King David recovered from over a century of excavation at the ‘City of David’, it is vital to highlight the extra biblical evidence that verifies the historicity of David. The extra biblical evidence supporting King David as a historical figure can be found upon the Mesha Stele and the Tel Dan Inscription, and while there remains active debate regarding the translation of these texts, both represent the most tangible physical evidence to directly reference David yet excavated. Both should be considered as corroborating evidence that such a man existed and was the founder of a political dynasty governing ancient Judah.

Carved from local basalt and engraved with Old Aramaic script, the Tel Dan Inscription is believed to have measured approximately a meter in height prior to its destruction. Discovered in July of 1993 the first piece of the stele was labeled ‘Fragment A’ by excavators Avraham Biran and Joseph Naveh with ‘Fragment B1’ and ‘Fragment B2’, collectively ‘Fragment B’, recovered in the summer of 1994. Consisting in total of 13 lines of text by far the most discussed is Line 9 of Fragment A and the mention of Ahaziah, king of the ‘House of David’. Biran and Naveh interpreted this line as referring to ‘the dynastic name of the kingdom of Judah’\(^{196}\), a conclusion contested by a vocal minority known as the ‘Copenhagen School’\(^{197}\) but accepted as accurate by the vast majority of Near Eastern scholars\(^{198}\).

\(^{196}\) Biran & Naveh 1993, 95-96.
3A) Interpreting the Tel Dan Inscription

To summarize the Tel Dan Stele, when all three pieces are placed together in the arrangement proposed by Biran and Naveh, relates the conquest of Israel and Judah by an anonymous King of Aram (Fig. 11). Whether or not the references to the defeat of ‘seventy kings’ as well as their ‘thousands of chariots and thousands of horses’ in Lines 6 and 7 of Fragment A are precise figures or simply an attempt by the author to convey the huge scale of his triumph remains unclear. The text tells us that Aram was victorious and declares the demise of Joram, King of Israel, and Ahaziah, ruler of the ‘House of David’ by enemy forces, events similar but not identical to those related in the biblical narrative, specifically 2 Kings 9: 16.

With regard to Biran and Naveh’s reading of bytdwd from Line 9 of Fragment A, rather then ‘House of David’ referring to a specific dynasty they instead conclude the author is referring to the country ruled by Ahaziah. Lending support to this argument is the fact that this practice was common in Assyria where designations of numerous Levantine states, such as Bit Humri, ‘House of Omri’ (Israel), Bit Agusi (Arpad) or Bit Haza’ili, ‘House of Hazael’ (Aram), were used interchangeably to refer to both dynastic entities and geographic areas they controlled. It was also Assyrian practice to designate each dynasty by the name of the monarch who ruled when the state was first encountered, suggesting that the reference to bytdwd not only proves a monarch named David founded a political dynasty in Judea, but also that this state was influential enough to warrant Assyrian attention.

Hence Biran and Naveh’s translation of bytdwd as ‘House of David’ is from contemporary evidence the most likely reading. Since ‘these designations were styled after the names of prominent rulers within these states’ the fact that the rulers of Aram identify a King David as having founded this Judean dynasty bolsters significantly
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arguments for David having been a legitimate historical figure. It is also worth noting that the biblical evidence supports the reading of bytdwd as ‘House of David’ in both 1 Kings 12:19 and Isaiah 7:2.\footnote{Ben-Zvi 1994, 26.}

\section*{3B) The Deposition and Destruction of the Tel Dan Inscription}

Located at the foot of Mount Hermon in the Golan region of Israel in the northeast of the country, the site of Tel Dan extends over .20 sq. km. Situated on the southern slope of the tel all three pieces of the Tel Dan Inscription were recycled in the vicinity of the gate area in order to construct the walls and pavements of a gated fortification that limiting access to the settlement above. Excavators Biran and Naveh have shown that all fragments of the Tel Dan Inscription were recovered from the same excavation area (Area A) alongside evidence for the outermost gateway of the aforementioned defenses.

Of the architectural features uncovered in Area A the most dominant is a large paved area (approx. 400 m²) surrounded by walls on all sides. At the southeastern corner of the pavement hinge sockets and hinge-pivots indicated a gate had once controlled traffic through the southern wall. A second gated entrance leading to Area T through the northern wall was recorded in the northwestern corner of the paved area. Area T has been designated a ritual space following the discovery of five standing stones (messebah) in 1995, with a third gate in the northern wall of Area T restricting access to the fortified road and the city atop the hill.

The first piece of the Tel Dan Inscription excavated, Fragment A, was discovered beneath a wall (W. 5073) marking the eastern perimeter of the large pavement dominating Area A. Recovered a little over 5 m. north of the gate threshold recorded in the southeastern corner of the paved area (Fig. 10), Fragment A was recycled as a base stone for wall 5073.\footnote{Biran 1994, 276.} Biran and Naveh have dated pottery found above both the paved
area and the southeastern gate to the second half of the 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, and since the latest sherds beneath these features dates to the first half of the 9\textsuperscript{th} century, the excavators propose both were constructed between 860 BCE and 732 BCE\textsuperscript{206}.

Following Halpern’s observation that W. 5073 appeared to have undergone several stages of construction, further information was published concerning this wall and the structures incorporating it to the east. The two earliest buildings recorded by the excavators, collectively dubbed Structure C, consisted of a large quadrilateral (5 x 10.5 m) while the other, also a rectangle, had smaller dimensions (3 x 5 m.). Biran concluded these structures represented early towers or defensive outposts\textsuperscript{207}. Pottery found upon the floors of both buildings were attributed to the early 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE while sherds beneath Structure C dated to the end of the 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{208}.

Contemporary with the construction of the pavement and southeastern gate (860-732 BCE)\textsuperscript{209} to the west of W 5073, Structure B and the second phase of development saw the wall extended north. Pottery from beneath the sections of the W. 5073 erected during this phase of construction were attributed to the second half of the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{210}. Fragment A was not deposited beneath W. 5073 until at least the second half of the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE as part of Structure A, the third and final phase of the wall’s development. That the pottery layer beneath Wall 5073 can be dated to the first half of the 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE further helps to establish the date of the stele’s deposition, for it is impossible for it to have been recycled after this period but no earlier than the mid-9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE and the pottery associated with Structure A.

3C) Fragments B1 & B2

Fragments B1 and B2 were both uncovered to the north of the wall built atop Fragment A (W. 5073). Fragment B1 was discovered in debris 13 m northeast of
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Fragment A while Fragment B2 was excavated a further 8 m north of Fragment B1. Fragment B2 was used as paving stone in a pathway contemporary with Structure A and the deposition of Fragment A, as the pottery from beneath these pavement dated to the end of the 9th century BCE and the beginning of the 8th century BCE. While the deposition of Fragment B2 can be confidently held to be contemporary with the recycling of Fragment A and the development of Structure A, Fragment B1 as it was recovered from a later stratum. This fragment was excavated from debris dating to the conquest of Tiglath- Pileser III (ca. 732 BCE), the layer covering the architectural features incorporating Fragment A and Fragment B2, suggesting that Fragment B1 was found in a tertiary context and was broken between the early 8th century BCE and the conquest of Tiglath- Pileser III in 732 BCE.

Hence just as first proposed by Biran and Naveh, Fragment B1 and Fragment B2 should be considered pieces of the same section of the greater Tel Dan Inscription, as both physically link together so well whilst the text on their surfaces aligning almost flawlessly. The fact that all three fragments were carved from basalt quarried in the local area also suggests the fragments belong to the same inscription.

Considering the excavators have shown that Fragment A and Fragment B2 were recycled after the western paved area was constructed in the second half of the 9th century BCE, but before the construction of the wall (W. 5073) built upon Fragment A in the mid-8th century BCE, it can be said with confidence that all three surviving pieces of the Tel Dan Inscription were deposited between these two dates.
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3D) Historical Context of the Tel Dan Inscription

Based on the dates Biran and Naveh have proposed for the stele’s production it is now widely believed that King Hazael of Aram commissioned the Tel Dan Inscription. Hazael ascended to the throne in 843 BCE and reigned for 90 years, hence it was during his monarchy that the stele was deposited and Aram developed into the dominant power in Syria-Palestine\(^{217}\). Wesselius in contrast has suggested Jehu of Israel, serving as a vassal of Hazael, may have erected the inscription\(^{218}\), while Athas has put forth Bar-Hadad II, Hazael’s son and successor. Since Bar-Hadad II ruled Aram during the first half of the 8\(^{\text{th}}\) century BCE, the latter portion of the chronological bracket within which the inscription could feasibly have been produced\(^{219}\), Athas’ theory remains a possibility.

That the influence of Aram during this period can be traced as far south as the Sea of Galilee\(^{220}\) also suggests Hazael or Bar-Hadad II erected the inscription, while the discovery of a sherd from a bowl with an Aramaic inscription upon it from the second 9\(^{\text{th}}\) century BCE construction phase at Tel Dan\(^{221}\) (the paved area, the hinged gate and the northern section of W. 5073) further reinforces this theory. Evidence of Israelite architecture, script and pottery do not begin appearing until the third and final construction phase of the 8\(^{\text{th}}\) century BCE, the period when Fragment A and Fragment B2 were deposited\(^{222}\).

According to the archaeological evidence the Tel Dan Inscription was engraved between the ascension to the throne of Aram by Hazael (ca. 843 BCE) and the death of his son and successor Bar Hadad II (ca. 750 BCE). It can also be concluded with confidence that the recycling of the three stele fragments occurred during the co-regency of Jehoash and his son Jeroboam (798-782 BCE) who later occupied the city\(^{223}\).
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As the Tel Dan Inscription was likely created as a piece of ‘propaganda boasting of Hazael’s victories on the northern border of Israel’\textsuperscript{224}, the text not only provides an important contribution to our understanding of Old Aramaic\textsuperscript{225} but also remains an invaluable source of information concerning the regional politics of the Near East during the late 9\textsuperscript{th} and 8\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE. Aside from relating the defeat of both Israel and Judah by the forces of Aram the text also provides what may arguably be one of the earliest known references to a Davidic royal lineage, with King Ahaziah of Judah specifically noted as belonging to the dynastic ‘House of David’ (Line 9).

\textbf{3E) Controversies and Alternative Readings}

Although Biran and Naveh’s translation and interpretation of the Tel Dan Inscription is now widely accepted many other theories have been presented that deserve attention\textsuperscript{226}. That both 2 Kings 15: 16- 22 and 2 Chronicles 16: 1-6 tell of Judah allying with Aram in a war against Israel, the reverse of the situation described in the Tel Dan Inscription, is of particular importance for both texts undermine the others accuracy/historicity and it is this particular inconsistency that has seen scholars question the inscriptions validity\textsuperscript{227}.

Yet among the alternative interpretations of bytdwd thus far proposed there have been suggestions that rather then a dynastic house the text relates to a deity, entitled ‘Dod’\textsuperscript{228} or ‘Daud’\textsuperscript{229}, while Barstad and Becking have theorized that bytdwd is not the name of a god but instead a divine epithet, roughly translatable to ‘beloved’\textsuperscript{230}. Arguments that the inscription rather refers to a temple\textsuperscript{231}, possibly even one based in
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Jerusalem\textsuperscript{232}, or donates a military/civic rank have also been presented, while others have suggested that \emph{bytdwd} indicates a provincial palace or administrative building\textsuperscript{233}.

Athas has also argued that \emph{bytdwd} should interpreted as ‘City of David’, a reference to Jerusalem\textsuperscript{234}, however, just as other suggestions that the inscription refers to a city rather then a dynastic state this argument ignores both the contemporary Assyrian texts as well as the biblical parallels listed above. This proposal also overlooks the fact that in Line 7 of the Tel Dan Inscription the ‘House of Omri’ is referenced using near identical language, again suggesting Biran and Naveh’s original interpretations remain the most reliable\textsuperscript{235}.

Finally some commentators have debated the translation of \emph{bytdwd} as ‘House of David’ based upon the absence of word divider that is sometimes found in Hebrew, Aramaic and Moabite texts when a specific state is referenced\textsuperscript{236}. And yet while numerous counter-arguments have been presented showing that \emph{bytdwd} is not the only instance where a word divider is absent\textsuperscript{237}, a reference to ‘Beth Horon’ upon Ostracon B from Tell Qasile for example\textsuperscript{238}, others have explained the omission away as either ‘scribal innovation’ or the ‘idioms peculiar to a single scribe’\textsuperscript{239}.

Rainey has also argued that a ‘word divider between two components in such a construction is often omitted, especially if the combination is a well-established proper name’\textsuperscript{240}. This suggests that although a divider is regularly used in Aramaic texts the rule was not applied to the ‘House of David’ reference, as \emph{bytdwd} by the time of the stele’s creation was already a commonly used, widely known title for the state of Judah. Again
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this reinforces the excavator’s original theory that language used in the inscription is indicative of references to other well-established regional powers.\textsuperscript{241}

Despite continuing arguments over the alignment of the three fragments comprising the Tel Dan Inscription\textsuperscript{242}, Biran and Naveh’s interpretation of the text remains dependable and accepted in mainstream scholarship. Concerns as to the context of Fragment B1 and debate relating to the correct translation of bytdwd aside, most now agree with the excavator that the Tel Dan Inscription remains the best extra biblical evidence for the existence of a King David as yet excavated.

3F) The Mesha Stele and the ‘House of David’

The Mesha Stele, also referred to as the Moabite Stone, is not only the ‘longest monumental inscription discovered anywhere in Palestine’\textsuperscript{243}, but also helps to confirm Biran and Naveh’s interpretation of dwd in the Tel Dan Inscription. Like the example from Dan, the Mesha Stele has not only a date, that is the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, but also mirrors the Tel Dan Inscription physically. Both stelai are made of black basalt, both were under a meter high and just over half a meter wide prior to their destruction and both were erected by enemies of Israel to commemorate their victories. Each inscription also names the respective Israelite monarch conquered, with Aram having defeated King Joram and Moab triumphing over King Ahab, son of the dynasties founder Omri.\textsuperscript{244}

First reported by missionary F. M. Klien in 1868 during a journey east of the Jordan River\textsuperscript{245}, the discovery of the stele amidst the ruins of Dhiban in ancient Moab resulted in a scramble by the various foreign schools in Jerusalem to acquire the inscription. The political maneuvers of these foreign powers to purchase the Moabite Stone, particularly the French and Prussian delegations,\textsuperscript{246} resulted in the Bedouin who
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had shown the inscription to Klien destroying the relic rather then have it turned over to the Ottoman authorities. Through the combined efforts of the French archaeologist Charles Clermont-Ganneau and British Royal Engineer Sir Charles Warren, the various fragments, etching and rubbings made of the Mesha Stele were consequently purchased and have been on display in the Louvre since 1875\textsuperscript{247}.

According to translations provided by Andre Lemaire\textsuperscript{248} the 34 lines of the inscription detail the successful insurrection of Mesha against the Israelite occupiers of Moab. The text makes specific reference to the kingdom of Israel and the fact that King Omri had occupied and ‘oppressed Moab many days’. That this repressive situation continued under Omri’s successor(s) is presented in the inscription as the motivation for the Moabite revolt (Lines 4-6), with subsequent lines detailing the names of towns, the numbers of enemy casualties as well as the civic accomplishments of King Mesha. It is of note that this account of the Moabite rebellion varies significantly from that presented in the biblical narrative (2 Kings 3: 4-27), with the later portraying the Moabite uprising as a failure in that rather then a military victory King Mesha secured the independence of his state through the sacrifice of his own son (2 King 3: 26-27).

Although the ‘House of Omri’ is referenced a number of times throughout the inscription (Lines 4-30), it is the inclusion of the term \textit{btdwd} in line 31 that has been most frequently compared to the Tel Dan Inscription. That King Mesha conquered the ‘House of David’ following victories against Israel is the only context the inscription provides for the \textit{btdwd} reference, albeit it is a similar one to that offered by the Tel Dan Inscription. According to Lemaire the Mesha Stele details the capture of a township named Horonen, located southeast of the Dead Sea, which the author of the inscription explains is ruled by the ‘House of David’.

\textsuperscript{247} Lemaire 1994, 33.
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3G) Similarities Between the Mesha and Tel Dan Inscriptions

That *btdwd* appears in the Mesha Stele and is paralleled by *bytdwd* in the Tel Dan Inscription has often been cited as proof that this reference to the dynastic ‘House of David’ by ‘two enemies of Judah very probably reveals that it was part of the official diplomatic language of this period’\(^{249}\). In contrast the fact that each reference is spelt differently has been used to counter this claim, although even within the Mesha inscription internal irregularities occur multiple times, the word for ‘House’ spelt ‘*bt* five times (in lines 7, 23, 27 and 30 [twice]) and *byt* only once (in line 25)\(^{250}\). Hence proposals that suggest differences in spelling invalidate the similarities between the references to the ‘House of David’ in the Mesha and Tel Dan inscriptions need only examine the former text to find examples of such grammatical inconsistencies.

That the texts were written in different languages, the Mesha Stele in Moabite the Tel Dan Inscription in Old Aramaic\(^{251}\), and by different scribes could also account for the alternative spellings of *btdwd/* *bytdwd*. Similarities between the ‘literary flow\(^{252}\) of the two inscriptions, both beginning with reference to the victor’s regal status, his predecessor and subsequent succession, followed by details of the campaign, also suggests that despite some differences both texts conformed to a genre or style that is common to Assyrian victory stelai predating the Moabite Stone.

Yet since there is no consensus as to role of Moabite among other northwest Semitic languages, with suggestions that it derived from Aramaic\(^{253}\), Hebrew\(^{254}\) or was a separate language entirely\(^{255}\), many alternative translations to ‘House of David’ have been presented, with suggestions ranging from ‘sacrificial fire’\(^{256}\) to ‘altar hearth’\(^{257}\).
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among the theories. Many of the same alternatives suggested for the Tel Dan Inscription are again proposed for btdwd, with references to deities including Yahweh\textsuperscript{258}, ‘Dod’ and ‘Daud’\textsuperscript{259}. As neither ‘Dod’ nor ‘Daud’ is known to have had an established cult of worship during this period it is unlikely that this interpretation is accurate, although ‘Dod’ is believed linked to the city of Ataroth\textsuperscript{260} while ‘Wadd’, worshipped in central Arabia prior to Islam, is another possible link to these earlier gods\textsuperscript{261}.

\textbf{3H) King David and the Temple of Amun at Karnak}

Finally it has also been proposed by K. A. Kitchen that a possible mention of David exists from the late 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, occurring upon the exterior south wall of the Temple of Amun at Karnak located at Thebes\textsuperscript{262}. Commissioned by Shoshenq I in 924 BCE, following his raid of Philistia the previous year, the triumphal scene lists the regions and places raided, with the areas covered by south Judah occurring in lines six through eight. Intriguingly in row eight mention of the ‘highland of d-w-t’ is made, a reference Kitchen argues should be read as ‘highland/heights of David’.

Comparing the reference to the 525 CE inscriptions of the Axumite Emperor Kaleb Ella Asbeha, who specifically refers to David by citing Psalms 65 as dawit ‘precisely the form that we have in our Egyptian list’\textsuperscript{263}. Alternatively Hoch suggests the ‘highland of d-w-t’ reference ‘could be a linked to Dothan’\textsuperscript{264}, yet this is less plausible as Dothan is in the north of the country, a region detailed in rows three through five of the Kanack list, and hence the wrong end of the country according to Kitchen\textsuperscript{265}.
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Conclusions

Coupled together the Mesha Stele and the Tel Dan Inscription are extra biblical sources that help in confirming David’s historicity as well as historicity for parts of the Old Testament. Yet the possibility that the Tel Dan Inscription refers to David also highlights the fact that Eilat Mazar’s aim, to uncover the Palace of David, is not founded exclusively upon the biblical narrative, for if there exist references to David outside the bible it is hard to maintain that he is exclusively a fabrication of the authors of the Old Testament. Essentially, these references justify the search for David, his kingdom and his structural legacy.
Chapter Four
The Bible, Archaeology and the Deeds of King David.

This chapter aims to provide a review of the Biblical tales of David, examining their worth as historical sources, the time of their composition and the archaeological evidence supporting the events attributed to David’s lifetime. Eilat Mazar’s use of the biblical narrative as a historical source in directing her excavations will also be discussed. Alternate theories that suggest David’s achievements should be attributed to rulers living closer to the time the Deuteronomistic History was first recorded shall also be explored, while a review of the existing evidence to support the traditional date and length of David’s rule will be presented.

4A) The Biblical Narrative and King David’s Palace

Following the traditional view of Biblical Archaeology championed by W. F. Albright and the ‘Albright School’ of scholars (i.e. Wright, Mendenhall, Freedman), Mazar adheres to the belief that the Bible can be taken as historically accurate and as a result began excavating for the express purpose of uncovering King David’s Palace; a theory she first discussed in a popular article for Biblical Archaeological Review in 1997. Published prior to the commencement of her 2005 campaign at the ‘City of David’, Mazar proposes further excavation of an area she contends should yield evidence of King David’s Palace based on passages from the Book of Samuel (2 Samuel 18: 33). That the arguments and conclusions presented in this 1997 article mirror those of publications produced after her discovery of the proposed palace suggests that regardless of what was revealed Mazar was intent on proving her hypothesis and not allowing the ‘stones speak for themselves’ as she suggests.
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That Mazar was inspired by passages in the Book of Samuel (Samuel 5: 11 and Samuel 5: 17) to explore the site in search of the Palace of King David is simply another example of her literal approach to the biblical narrative\textsuperscript{272}, the text dictating the interpretation of archaeological research. Following 2 Samuel 5:11, which explains how the artisans of King Hiram of Tyre built a palace for David, Mazar concludes that therefore there must have existed such a building\textsuperscript{273}, while identifying its location through a reference in verse 17 of the same text\textsuperscript{274}. Following David’s conquest of Jerusalem, the Book of Samuel explains that the ‘Philistines marched up in search of David; but David heard of it, and went down to the stronghold’ (Samuel 5: 17)\textsuperscript{275}.

Following this passage Mazar argues that this ‘city fortress stood to the south of the palace’ and that ‘since it can be reasonably assumed that this fortress had stood to the south of the northern edge of the Canaanite city…the new palace, consequently, must have been built just to the outside of the city wall’\textsuperscript{276}. The fact that Samuel 5:17 describes David walking ‘down to the stronghold’ has lead Mazar to conclude that the northern limits of the City of David terminated below and to the south of the ‘Zedek Valley’, a conclusion first posited by Duncan and Macalister in 1925\textsuperscript{277}. Yet while archaeology has shown that some architectural features detailed in the Old Testament reflect historical reality, for example the Siloam Tunnel constructed by Hezekiah prior to the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE\textsuperscript{278} (2 Kings 20: 20), evidence to support the ‘stronghold’ Mazar employs to locate King David’s Palace has yet to be excavated or has simply not been preserved.

Following Shiloh’s conclusions regarding of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’\textsuperscript{279}, rather then being integrated with King David’s Palace as Mazar now contends\textsuperscript{280}, she first
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proposed in her 1997 article that the terrace served as the an architectural support for the Fortress of Zion (2 Samuel 5: 7)\textsuperscript{281}. Yet while no archaeological evidence to support the historicity of this fortress has yet been revealed Mazar continues to orientate her excavations based on Samuel 5: 17 and the as yet unexcavated ‘stronghold’\textsuperscript{282}. Mazar’s approach to the site is therefore flawed in that she has based her interpretation of a structure that exists only in the biblical narrative and which is supported by no corroborating physical or material evidence.

Essentially Mazar’s stance toward archaeology is best summed up by an interview given to Etgar Lefkovits for the \textit{Jerusalem Post} dated to the 26\textsuperscript{th} of September 2008. Described as having at times been both ‘revered and reviled’ by some of her colleagues for being a Biblical Archaeologist, Mazar asserts that despite such criticism the ‘Bible is unquestionably the most important historical source for her work, since it contains a genuine historical account of the past’\textsuperscript{283}. Yet even if this were true Eilat Mazar’s excavations have revealed only the foundations of walls and not the palatial architecture described in the biblical narrative (1 Chronicles 14:1; 2 Samuel 5: 11). And while she cites Kenyon’s discovery of the Proto- Aeolic capital and associated ashlar masonry at the based of the ridge as support for her theories, no campaign in over one hundred years of scholarship at the ‘City of David’ has yet revealed ashlar masonry or Proto- Aeolic capitals in the area excavated by Mazar, including her own.

Mazar’s claims regarding the recent discovery in October 2008 of a water tunnel at the ‘City of David’ also illustrates her stance toward the biblical narrative as history, maintaining that these discoveries ‘illuminate the ancient history of Jerusalem and the reality described in the Bible’\textsuperscript{284}. Due to the fact that the biblical accounts describe there having been a wall in the ‘Ophel’ area south of the Haram al- Sharif during the reign of Solomon Mazar refers to these fortifications as a ‘Solomonic city-wall’. Yet this not simply overlooks evidence from Mazar’s own excavations that prove the only walls
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recorded from the area were constructed during the 8th and 7th centuries BCE\textsuperscript{285}, but also ignores the fact that there is less corroborating archaeological evidence to support Solomon’s existence then there is for David\textsuperscript{286}.

Evidentially by approaching the site with a presupposed verdict, albeit from information provided by a source the excavator considers factual, Mazar falls prey to what several scholars describe as ‘circular logic’, for by using the biblical narrative to confirm the details of these same stories there is no room for alternatives, just the confirmation of pre-existing textual ‘facts’. Mazar’s assertion that the palace of David must be located below and to the south of the Haram al- Sharif is based on Samuel 5:17, a reference to David descending from his palace to a fortress. Apart from the fact that the geography of the area has changed due to erosion over the past 3,000 years\textsuperscript{287}, Mazar’s publications on the topic omits arguments opposed to reading the biblical narrative as fact, for the discovery of King David’s Palace confirms the accuracy of the biblical account and vice versa.

Mazar also believes that the descriptions in 2 Samuel 5: 6- 9 and 1 Chronicles 11: 4- 7 accords with fortifications and finds from earlier periods, such as the Middle Bronze wall excavated by Kenyon and Shiloh. She therefore concludes that the Jebusite city conquered by King David in ca. 1,000 BCE was also ‘strong and well-fortified’, despite admitting that there are ‘no considerable architectural remains that can be confidently attributed to this period’\textsuperscript{288}. Mazar also cites Late Bronze Age walls (1550- 1200 BCE) uncovered by Shiloh and Kenyon as evidence for the existence of Adoni-zedek, King of Jerusalem according to Joshua 10: 1, while her literal reading of Genesis 14: 18\textsuperscript{289} suggests King Melchizedek was a historical figure, despite no extra- biblical evidence citing this monarch having yet been excavated\textsuperscript{290}.
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4B) Dating the Achievements of King David as Detailed in the Bible

In order to address the Deuteronomistic History as a source information concerning David’s lifetime it is important to first examine the specific sections relevant to these stories. David’s achievements and ultimate downfall are contained within the larger text biblical scholars have termed, at least since the 1940s, the Deuteronomistic History spans the books of Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings, receiving its name from the stylistic similarities to the fifth and final book of the Torah291.

Of these books the events of David’s life are then divided by scholars into two further segments, a hypothesis first posited by Martin Noth292, with the first ‘The History of David’s Rise’ (1 Samuel 16:14- 2 Samuel 5) relating David’s achievements as a youth, and the second, the ‘Court or Succession History’ (2 Samuel 9- 20 & 1 Kings 1- 5), his accomplishments and failings as a King293. To roughly determine the dates of David’s rule one must employ to some degree the Bible along with the Tel Dan and Mesha inscriptions, the only extra biblical evidence directly referencing the ‘House of David’294, for the Old Testament provides information concerning later monarchs of Judah and Israel whose existence, names and reigns are confirmed by foreign sources295.

Archeological evidence from surrounding regions aids significantly in dating the later monarchs of Israel and Judah, as Babylonian and Assyrian writings refer to these rulers, and from these quantifiable historical points, the length of David’s reign can be estimated. For instance Jehoiachin is the last King of the Davidic dynasty and his release from captivity in Babylon is recorded in 2 Kings 25: 27 as occurring in the first year of Amel-Marduk’s kingship, a reign that Babylonian sources indicated began in 561 BCE296. Likewise the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in 597 BCE, again during
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the Jehoiachin’s rule, is recorded in *The Babylonian Chronicle*\(^{297}\), while Manasseh (698-642 BCE) is listed as having given tribute to the Assyrian King Esarhaddon in an inscription from 674 BCE\(^{298}\). A tribute payment by Ahaz (743-727 BCE) to Tiglathpileser III, dated to 734 BCE, also helps confirm the biblical chronology\(^{299}\).

It is also vital to note that some extra biblical sources discuss events not covered in the Deuteronomistic History despite being contemporary to events chosen for inclusion. Shalmanesar III of Assyria (ca. 859-824 BCE) records a war fought against King Ahab that is not included in the Bible, while also commissioning a basalt obelisk that depicts King Jehu offering tribute to Assyria\(^{300}\), arguably the first and only artistic depiction as yet uncovered of a biblical King\(^{301}\).

The Tel Dan Stele mentions of the ‘House of Omri’\(^{302}\) and the conquering of Dan by Hazael, again an event largely omitted from the biblical narrative, while the Mesha Stele refers to King Omri and his conquering of Moab\(^{303}\). Again these two inscriptions provide confirmation of not only the political influence held by the kingdom of Israel during the 9\(^{\text{th}}\) century BCE, but also quantifiable dates for the events described. Based on these foreign sources, and taking the years of the periods presented in both 1 and 2 Kings for the reigns of these monarchs as roughly accurate, it can be said with due caution that King David’s rule lasted forty years from 1010-970 BCE\(^{304}\). In contrast other biblical accounts such as the battle between David and Goliath (Samuel 17) is held by some to be entirely fictional\(^{305}\).
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4C) The Historicity and Archaeology of the Biblical Narrative

Although the Bible as a source of history has become anathema to many Old Testament and Near Eastern scholars, considering the weight of criticism directed toward Biblical Archaeology it is important to recognize that the Bible is the ‘most significant literary product of Iron Age II Judea’. Yet the biblical narrative remains but one of the many sources relating the history of the region available. In addition while several of the events described therein are now known through excavation to be inaccurate, the Old Testament continues to help archaeologists understand the history of the Near East alongside the texts of neighboring civilizations (i.e. Moab, Assyria, Babylon).

Archaeologically two of the earliest examples of biblical passages yet excavated were discovered in Jerusalem and are attributed to the late Iron Age II; both are blessings from Numbers 6: 24-26 inscribed upon a pair of silver amulets. Because no evidence dating earlier then these two examples has yet been recorded, several scholars believe the Old Testament was first composed during the later years of Iron Age II (ca. 722-540 BCE). Yet whether the Bible is recognized as a strictly literary creation of Iron Age authors, a series of oral traditions first recorded during this period, or a combination of a variety of texts, suggestions that it should be seen as a factual, firsthand account are not supported by archaeological evidence.

The problem of dating the Deuteronomistic History impacts discussion of both the historicity of King David and the United Monarchy in general, although the years attributed to the reigns of later kings can be confirmed through extra biblical evidence (i.e. The Babylonian Chronicle, Siloam Tunnel Inscription). Essentially the issue is not just in discovering when the Deuteronomistic History was first written but whether or not
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the stories recorded are based on earlier sources, written or oral, or constitute firsthand accounts of Iron Age events. The traditional view among Biblical Archaeologists is that they were the later, authentic records relating reliable details\textsuperscript{312}, were as at the opposite extreme there are those who see the Deuteronomistic History as being an entirely fictional work\textsuperscript{313}.

Though arguments can be made for both the historicity and non-historicity of the Deuteronomistic History it is likely that the editors of this profound work were never aiming to write a history, at least as modern scholars/readers understand the term. Instead it is far more probable that the compilers of the Bible were focused upon the preservation of traditions, the presentation of morality tales, and the recording of various deeds then a strict recitation of chronological events, with troop numbers and even the reigns of monarchs often suspiciously accurate and rounded off\textsuperscript{314}. As the \textit{History of the Peloponnesian War} by Thucydides (460- 395 BCE) is considered to be the first example of a ‘scientific history’\textsuperscript{315}, although even he includes mythological accounts, the Deuteronomistic History was likely a fusion of traditional legends, morality tales, wisdom literature such as proverbs, genealogies and firsthand reports\textsuperscript{316}.

\textbf{4D) David in History: The Biblical Vs Historical David.}

Considering that the tales of David’s life and reign presented in the Bible have been shown not to be entirely accurate historical accounts\textsuperscript{317}, it is importance to consider the sources of these stories and when they were first compiled into the forms we know and read today. Although many arguments have been presented upon the topic over the decades, the earliest public inscription dates to the 8\textsuperscript{th} century suggesting that literacy had become less exclusive by this time\textsuperscript{318}. The fact that the event it relates is believed to be evidence for Hezekiah’s construction of the Siloam Tunnel prior to the invasion of
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Sennacherib in 701 BCE\textsuperscript{319}, for he ‘made the pool and the conduit and brought water to the city’ (2 Kings 20: 20), serves to both confirm aspects of the Bible as historical and provide a date for the inscriptions manufacture.

An increase in other forms of writing throughout Judah during the late 8\textsuperscript{th} and early 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE, including weight stones discovered at Jerusalem and the famed \textit{lmlk} storage jars suggest that being semi-literate was a requirement for commercial exchange\textsuperscript{320}. With each jar distinguished by a short Hebrew inscription reading \textit{lmlk} (‘belonging to the king’) followed by the name of a town, typically Hebron, Socoh or Ziph, the \textit{lmlk} jars and inscribed measures indicate a ‘network of connections and exchanges made possible only by the spread of literacy out into the countryside, presumably from royal secretaries and scribes in Jerusalem’\textsuperscript{321}.

Coupled with an increase at many sites in the number of inscribed signet seals bearing personal names and emblems\textsuperscript{322}, indicative of a concern for property rights, administration, ownership and social status, the \textit{lmlk} jar and Siloam inscriptions provide strong evidence to suggest that by the time of Hezekiah’s reign (ca. 727- 698 BCE) illiteracy was becoming less commonplace\textsuperscript{323}. After all, it would be illogical for the number of public inscriptions to increase if the number of people able to read them remained low. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the ‘first signs of widespread literacy in Judah mark the earliest possible time when ancient oral traditions could be collected, reworked, and edited together in the form of written texts’\textsuperscript{324}.

Archaeological remains from across the Near East offer no physical proof of a state such as the kingdom attributed to David in the biblical narrative having existed during the 10\textsuperscript{th} century (2 Samuel 8: 2). On the contrary a significant amount of textual and material evidence has been discovered confirming the existence of the Omride
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Dynasty, the achievements of the Israelite monarchs often mirroring those the biblical narrative attributes to David. It is also unfeasible considering the population of Judah during the 10th century for David to have amassed an army capable of capturing territory stretching south to the Red Sea and east to encompass Damascus. Archaeological evidence shows that David’s conquest of Edom is also chronologically impossible, as the state was not formed until the mid-9th century\textsuperscript{325}, with Ammon and Moab likely to have been developing regional powers just prior to the rise of the Israelite Monarchy (Fig. 4)\textsuperscript{326}.

It was not until the 9th century BCE that the first archaeological signs of state formation begin to appear in Judah, with the population steadily growing and new administrative centers constructed in the Judahite lowlands (Fig. 6)\textsuperscript{327}. In the Shephelah construction of two citadels occurred during the 9th century, one at Lachish the other at Beth-Shemesh. Excavations directed by David Ussishkin have revealed at Lachish an enormous podium that supported a fortified complex\textsuperscript{328}, complete with storerooms and palace, while recent campaigns led by Shlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman at Beth-Shemesh have uncovered a subterranean water system and further fortifications from the same period\textsuperscript{329}. Evidence of trade, fortifications and the development of water systems are all indicative of a centralized administration because all require more manpower and resources than a single individual, dynasty or family could muster alone.

4E) David, Goliath and the Excavation of the Philistine City of Gath

Despite the apparent inconsistency between material and textual evidence other information related in the Deuteronomic History has helped in determining when these stories were first recorded. The Philistine city of Gath features prominently throughout ‘The History of David’s Rise’, included among a coalition of five Philistine coastal cities (Joshua 13:3 & 1 Samuel 6:17) consisting also of Gaza, Ashkelon, Ekron and Ashdod.
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David even allies with the ruler of Gath, King Achish, when the later confronts Saul (1 Samuel 29:2-11). Although it was prominent as a member of the Philistine ‘Pentapolis’ in the Deuteronomistic History, Gath is omitted from later biblical texts from the 7th/6th century BCE (Zephaniah 2:4 & Jeremiah 25:20), with 7th century Assyrian royal records also removing the once prominent city from the coalition.\footnote{Pritchard 1969, 254-351.}

Archeological excavations at Tel es-Safi, the site of ancient Gath, may have found the answer to this exclusion, for finds from the 9th century BCE show the city suffered a major catastrophe.\footnote{Hartman 2010, 10.} Most likely the result of an invasion by Hazael, king of Aram-Damascus, during the 9th century (2 Kings 12:17), and a subsequent earthquake, Aren Maeir has shown Gath was a sizable city prior to the campaign of Hazael, spanning an area of about a hundred acres.\footnote{Maeir 2008, 2079-2081. See also Maeir & Uziel 2007, 29-42.} According to Maeir, Gath did not recover as an urban centre until after the 7th century,\footnote{Maeir 2001, 111-131.} explaining why the city is listed in the annals of Sargon II (722-705 BCE) as subservient to Ashdod rather than an equal.\footnote{Na’amant 2006, 40. See also Fuchs 1994, 134.} It also suggests that the Davidic stories that do include Gath contain some factual points, or that ‘there had at least been a memory or folk tradition of its lost greatness’\footnote{Finkelstein & Silberman 2006, 40.} (Fig. 4).

The inclusion of Gath in the coalition helps reinforce arguments for at least parts of the Bible being written during David’s reign (1010-970 BCE)\footnote{Halpern, 1988, 125.} while also supporting a case for those who suggest it was written later, possibly during the 8th century BCE,\footnote{Finkelstein & Silberman 2006, 133-134.} but contained historical facts impossible for the author to know unless through an oral/storytelling tradition.\footnote{Lemche, 1994, 165-190. See also Thompson, T. L. 1999b and De Vaux, 1978.} Coupled with the results of excavations at Ekron that show the city was destroyed in the early 10th century BCE,\footnote{Dothan & Gitin 1993, 1053-1055. See also Dothan & Gitin 1987, 202-205.} never regaining its former power before its final destruction in the 7th century BCE by Nebuchadnezzar,\footnote{Gitin 1997, 77-103. See also Gitin, Dothan & Naveh 1997, 9-16.} it becomes clear
that the ‘limits of historical memory’ in the Deuteronomistic History range from prior to the destruction of Gath by Hazael (mid 9th century BCE) but before the decline in influence of Ekron (early 10th century BCE)\textsuperscript{341}.

Coincidentally one such story featuring Gath, that of David’s famed defeat of the giant Goliath (1 Samuel 17) also serves to counter arguments for the historicity of David’s achievements, with 1 Samuel 17 considered to be a largely fictitious account. Intriguingly evidence for this case is also drawn from the Deuteronomistic History, and features a hero by the name of Eurtha who is said to have felled Goliath of Gath. Apart from casting doubt upon the validity of the Davidic tradition concerning the defeat of Goliath, this passage also shows that the editors of the Bible were drawing from a number of different sources and traditions, attempting to produce a holistic coverage of past events rather than a single authoritative history.

4F) The Wars and Achievements of King David

David’s conquest and achievements mirror those of the Omride dynasty, with archaeological evidence and extra biblical sources attesting to their successful subjugation of Moab as well as Israel’s involvement in the alliance of 853 BCE and the battle of Qarqar. According to the Deuteronomistic History (1 Kings 16: 15-24) Omri, the dynasty’s founder, came to power in a \textit{coup d’etat}, established his capital at Samaria and was preceded by his son Ahab (1 Kings 16: 15-24). Yet it is only from extra biblical sources that the achievements of the dynasty are recognized, for the ‘House of Omri’ is referred to by Shalmaneser III, with ‘Ahab the Israelite’ recorded as having contributed two thousand chariots and ten thousand soldiers to anti-Assyrian coalition\textsuperscript{342}.

Stretching their empire into Transjordan and even capturing Damascus, King Omri is recorded upon the Mesha Stele as having ‘humbled Moab many days’, a control

\textsuperscript{341} Na’amān 2006, 55.
\textsuperscript{342} Williamson 1996, 41-51.
maintained by Ahab and ending following Moabite revolt. Likewise the Tel Dan inscription also indicates that the ‘House of Omri’ had occupied land once claimed by Aram, territory reclaimed by Hazael during the invasions of 851 BCE. That David’s conquest of Edom (2 Sam. 8:13) mirrors Amaziah’s victory against the Edomites in the Valley of Salt in the early 8th century BCE also suggests that the duplication and assignment of Omri’s achievements to David was not unique to his war against Moab. Whether Euratha, Ahab or Omri, the substitution of David for the historical victor in these events supports arguments against the Deuteronomistic History being an entirely accurate, firsthand record.

Conclusions

Whether the stories of David are taken as authentic history or are read for their intrinsic moral value, the Deuteronomistic History tells a tale of heroism and tragedy. Although these stories cannot be substantiated through archaeology, through extra biblical texts the activities of later Israeli and Judean kings can be authenticated. Instead of primary accounts the stories of David are likely to remain unauthenticated retellings of traditional tales, often involving events taken from history but with the victorious leader (Omri, Ahab, Amaziah) replaced by King David. That King David was a legitimate historical figure is attested to in the Tel Dan and Mesha inscriptions, with both independently referencing the ‘House of David’ as the ruling power in 9th century BCE Judah. The specific details of what David achieved, the exact length of his reign and the true extent of his kingdom are as yet unknown.
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Chapter Five
The Findings and Focus of Professor Eilat Mazar’s ‘City of David’ Excavations.

The aim of this chapter is to scrutinize the conclusions of Eilat Mazar regarding her proposed discovery of King David’s Palace. By examining Mazar’s publications, those of her peers and the results of prior excavators, the site of the theoretical palace, currently located within the ‘City of David’ archaeological park, will be explored in order to provide an accurate account of the ruins excavated. Through her work at the site, the literary evidence she bases her theories upon, as well as the contradictions between her conclusions and those of her archaeological predecessors, the arguments for and against Eilat Mazar’s proposals will be discussed, as will alternative interpretations offered since the publication of her findings. Ultimately it is the purpose of this chapter to reach a conclusion regarding not only Mazar’s interpretations but also the structures uncovered during her excavations.

5A) The Material Evidence and Interpretations of Eilat Mazar

Having examined the textual and historical foundations upon which Eilat Mazar has based her work at the ‘City of David’ site, the evidence excavated and presented by Mazar in favor of her proposal regarding King David’s Palace will be evaluated. Essentially Mazar’s theory centres on her discovery of a series of walls she interpreted as combining to form the foundations for a single building, which she dubbed the ‘Large Stone Structure’\(^{347}\). Although Mazar dates the central wall (Wall 107) to the reign of David, she ultimately attributes two to three phases of construction to the hypothetical palace, including among the renovations a series of northern walls that, unlike their southern counterparts, are not bonded to Wall 107 and are datable to the late 9\(^{th}\) century BCE\(^{348}\).

\(^{347}\) E. Mazar 2006a, 23.
\(^{348}\) E. Mazar 2006b, 15.
5B) Preliminary Excavations of the ‘Large Stone Structure’

Consisting of two published seasons of excavation, the first in 2005 and the second in 2006/07, both of Eilat Mazar’s campaigns together covered 600 sq m. (300 per season). These encompass the northern limits of Macalister and Duncan’s Field 5, directly west of Shiloh’s Area G, and Kenyon’s Trench 1 (Area A) upon the crest of the eastern slope. Despite these previous extensive investigations, Mazar’s project has revealed finds that were previously unknown to archaeologists, with Wall 107 the principal structure in a building Mazar has concluded served as the foundations for King David’s Palace.

Described by Mazar as being of ‘impressive proportions’ the foundations for the walls of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ were recorded across the excavation area (600 sq. m.). Walls delineating rooms to the north (Rooms B and C) and south (Room A) are linked to a wall labeled W107 by Mazar, while another wall (W20) constructively integrated with W107 running south marks the eastern extreme of the ‘Large Stone Structure’. These walls were built from stones measuring 65 x 85 x 32 cm. on average and while some were found in situ other blocks were found either in rubble, some uncovered just 2 m. below the surface level, or recycled for use in structures erected during the Hasmonean period.

The central wall of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ (Wall 107) runs west to east for 28.4 m. and measures between 2.5- 3 m. in width. Wall 107 is described by Mazar as ‘slightly curved’ with walls bonded to the structure running at right angles to the south (W67, W74 and W20) while those running perpendicular to the north (W19, W21 and W109) were not bonded to Wall 107. In the southwestern corner of the site Room A was recorded, employing W107 as its northern wall. Both the eastern (W67) and western
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349 E. Mazar 2009, 11.
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353 E. Mazar 2007, 47.
walls (W74) of Room A are integrated structurally with W107, while the southern extremes of Room A were destroyed as a consequence of construction during the Second Temple period (167 BCE- 70 CE)\textsuperscript{354}.

The eastern wall (W20) of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ runs along the eastern edge of the ridge directly to the north of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ (4.6- 7.6. m.) and west of Yigal Shiloh’s Area G\textsuperscript{355}. W20 is structurally bonded with W107 running parallel to W67 and W74 (Room A) to the west, while the point where W107 and W20 join marks the northeastern corner of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ (Fig. 9). Dated by Mazar to 1000 BCE\textsuperscript{356}, W20 at the close of the second excavation season measured 20 m. in length and no more than 3 m. in width. Wall 20 is abutted on its eastern side by the structure Duncan and Macalister dubbed the ‘Maccabean Tower’\textsuperscript{357}. According to Mazar this tower, the ‘Tower of David’ and the fortifications running north all reused aspects of Wall 20 and all are attributable to the Hasmonaean period (ca. 167- 37 BCE)\textsuperscript{358}.

Alternatively Mazar concludes that the walls running north of W107 were neither contemporary with or bonded to the ‘Large Stone Structure’. Recorded as W19, W21 and W109, listed in order from east to west, Mazar concluded that these walls were later 10\textsuperscript{th}-9\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE additions based on Iron Age IIA pottery recovered from the floors of the rooms these walls define. Labeled Room C and Room B by Mazar these two rooms are divided by wall 21 with wall 109 the western wall of Room B and W19 serving as the eastern wall of Room C\textsuperscript{359}. Within Room B a ‘bench-like installation’ (Wall 26) was excavated adjacent to W107 with pottery from beneath it dating to the Iron Age IIA (10\textsuperscript{th}-9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE), while to the north of the Wall 26 under Stone Pavement 717 pottery sherds attributed to the 10\textsuperscript{th}-9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE were also recorded\textsuperscript{360}.

\textsuperscript{354} E. Mazar 2009, 49.
\textsuperscript{355} Shiloh 1984, 30.
\textsuperscript{356} E. Mazar 2007, 17- 18, 63.
\textsuperscript{357} Duncan & Macalister 1926, 49.
\textsuperscript{358} E. Mazar 2007, 71.
\textsuperscript{359} E. Mazar 2009, 49- 50.
\textsuperscript{360} Ibid, 51.
In Room C, recovered from a narrow 25-70 cm. slot between the stones of Wall 22, an abutment to W107, and W24 to the north, Mazar has further recorded material she dates to the 10th-9th centuries BCE (Locus 47). Finds from this assemblage included a Black-on-Red juglet imported from Cyprus, traditionally dated to the second half of the 10th century BCE and an ivory blade or mirror handle Mazar compares to a 10th century BCE sword shaft from a Phoenician tomb at Achziv. Radiocarbon dating of bone from Locus 47 provided a similar chronological bracket.

Running parallel to the western segment of wall107 Mazar revealed several structures, including W79, W85 and Pavement 565. Located approximately 4 m. north of W107, with W85 a further 2 m. to the north again, wall W79 was found to have been cut to accord for W80, a structure Mazar argues was the eastern portion of a tower podium. Since Pavement 565 ran between W79 and W85, adjacent to W80, Mazar has proposed that these features constitute part of the entrance complex to the Large Stone Structure, however, she has also conceded that W85 and the northern additions to W107 (W19, W21 and W109) may be the southern continuation of walls found in Kenyon’s Square HII.

Based on these finds Mazar concluded that walls bonded and running perpendicular to the south of Wall 107 were contemporaneously constructed alongside the ‘Large Stone Structure’ (1000 BCE) while those to the north were later extensions and should instead be dated to Iron IIA (10th-9th century BCE). Yet since no material remains have been linked directly to either W107 or W20 there is no way of knowing whether or not the northern walls and the rooms they define were built years, weeks or days after their southern counterparts.
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5C) Dating the ‘Large Stone Structure’.

Mazar has based her 10th century BCE attribution of Wall 107 and Wall 20 partially upon the fact that the strata directly beneath these walls contained sherds ‘mostly from cooking pots’ datable to the Iron I (12th- 11th centuries BCE)\textsuperscript{368}. This stratum, identified as the ‘brown earth accumulation’\textsuperscript{369}, is an earthy layer measuring roughly 10 cm. in thickness that Mazar contends was ‘deposited over a period centuries as the result of intensive social and economic activity’\textsuperscript{370}. The ‘brown earth accumulation’ separates the foundations of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ from bedrock in the east of the excavation area and to the west a purposely flattened, leveled stratum Mazar dates to no earlier then the Middle Bronze Age II (2000- 1550 BCE)\textsuperscript{371}.

Highlighting the presence of animal bones and faunal material recovered from within the ‘brown earth accumulation’ Mazar concludes that this area served as a meeting and/or marketplace\textsuperscript{372}. Floral and faunal remains recovered reinforce this proposal, with Mazar suggesting that the slaughter of the later occurred either at or in ‘proximity to the site’ since all animal bones were found disarticulated. Furthermore of the sheep and goat remains, which represent 85% of the faunal evidence recovered, 80% were found to be adults\textsuperscript{373}. Coupled with the fact that 60% of the botanical remains recorded were of cultivated plants, primarily grain and olives\textsuperscript{374}, the ‘brown earth accumulation’ was formed as a result of trade activity as Mazar suggests.

Mazar’s dating of the ‘brown earth accumulation’ also employs dates provided by the faunal and floral remains recovered from this stratum, with the animal bones and botanical remains radiocarbon tested and yielding results that suggest the deposition of

\textsuperscript{368} E. Mazar 2009, 37.
\textsuperscript{369} E. Mazar 2007, 29. See also Finkelstein, Herzog, Singer- Avitz & Ussishkin 2007, 144.
\textsuperscript{370} E. Mazar 2009, 29.
\textsuperscript{371} Ibid. 28. See also E. Mazar 2007, 30.
\textsuperscript{372} E. Mazar 2006a, 25. See also E. Mazar 2009, 26- 30 and E. Mazar 2007, 29.
\textsuperscript{373} E. Mazar 2009, 38. Of the animal bones recorded by Noa Raban- Gerstel and Dr. Guy Bar- Oz of the University of Haifa 85% were sheep and goat remains while 12.4% were from cattle.
\textsuperscript{374} E. Mazar 2007, 49. Of the grains recorded by Dr. Ehud Weiss and Dr. Yoel Melamed of Bar- Ilan University the most prominent was Triticum parvicoccom while amongst the fruits Olea europea, the common olive, was the most common.
the layer continued until the late Iron Age I and early Iron IIA\textsuperscript{375}. The ‘brown earth accumulation’ is recorded as containing pottery sherds ranging from the Middle Bronze Age (2000- 1550 BCE) through to Iron I (1200- 1000 BCE). Comparing the Iron I sherds to assemblages from Giloh and Shiloh V\textsuperscript{376}, Mazar suggests that since the fragments are badly worn these finds came from the very end of Iron Age I (1000 BCE) and ‘not earlier’\textsuperscript{377}.

Based on these finds Mazar concludes that the ‘Large Stone Structure’ built atop the ‘brown earth accumulation’ was constructed around the middle of the 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, when the Bible says King David ruled the United Kingdom of Israel\textsuperscript{378}. As Mazar employs this stratum to date W20 her hypothesis that the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ was bonded to the ‘Large Stone Structure’ via this easternmost wall contradicts the findings of Kenyon and Shiloh, who have both independently shown that the upper portions of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ were erected no earlier than the 7\textsuperscript{th} century BCE\textsuperscript{379}.

5D) Finds Relating to the ‘Large Stone Structure’ and the Use of the Site in Subsequent Periods

During the second season of excavations (2006/07) Mazar recorded two buildings and a neighboring area of ‘Chalk Floor’, with Room E employing the western face of W20 as an eastern wall. Measuring 2.15 m. wide Mazar recorded evidence of ‘small-scale metallurgical activity’ from Room E, comparing the assemblage of ceramic crucibles and blowpipes to Tel Dan Strata VI- IV (12\textsuperscript{th} - 11\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE)\textsuperscript{380}. Although little remains of Room D parallel sherds were founded beneath a paved surface within the structure dating to the 10\textsuperscript{th} - 9\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE while Mazar has attributed the adjacent ‘chalk floor’ to the same period.

\textsuperscript{375} E. Mazar 2009, 38- 39. See also E. Mazar 2007, 48- 49.
\textsuperscript{377} E. Mazar 2006a, 25.
\textsuperscript{378} E. Mazar 2009, 18.
\textsuperscript{379} Shiloh 1984, 28. See also Kenyon 1974, 137.
\textsuperscript{380} Biran 1989, 125, 128.
Measuring 10.8 m. from east to west and 15.6 m. from north to south, Mazar cites the presence of the ‘chalk floor’ as evidence of a link between the various walls comprising the ‘Large Stone Structure’, the ‘chalk floor’ abutting W218 to the east and W214 upon the western margins of Mazar’s excavation area. It has also been suggested by Mazar that this area served as a courtyard and hence she has proposed that the ‘Large Stone Structure’ may have followed either the Bit- Hilani style, the Lateral- Access Podium structure (LAP) model, or comprised a local combination of the two.

However when compared to known examples of Bit- Hilani architecture in the Near East the ‘Large Stone Structure’ as presented by Mazar (Fig. 3) shows few similarities. Bit- Hilani structures are defined by specific architectural features, including a raised throne room, accessible via a broad stairway and columned portico, none of which Mazar has recorded during her excavations at the ‘City of David’. That Ilan Sharon and Anabel Zarzecki- Peleg argue that ‘no palatial buildings in Israel or in the southern Levant as a whole can be demonstrated to have these defining characteristics’ also suggests the ‘Large Stone Structure’ was not build according to the Bit- Hilani style.

Sharon and Zarzecki- Peleg have proposed that rather then the Bit- Hilani type Israeli and Levantine administrative structures instead followed a style they have labeled the ‘Lateral- Access Podium’ model. Accessible via a ramp that leads to the elevated levels of the LAP structure, Sharon and Zarzeck- Peleg suggest that the upper floors of the building were built upon a high podium often built against a enclosure or city wall, and while Mazar contends that the ‘Large Stone Structure’ was built against the northern fortifications of ancient Jerusalem, the lack of a ramp and clearly defined podium suggests that the walls excavated by Mazar do not follow either the Bit- Hilani or ‘Lateral- Access Podium’ models as defined by Sharon and Zarzecki- Peleg.

381 Frankfort 1952, 120–131. See also E. Mazar 1997, 57.
382 Sharon & Zarzecki- Peleg 2006, 145- 167. See also E. Mazar 2009, 63.
383 Reich 1992, 206. See also Sharon & Zarzecki- Peleg 2006, 145.
386 Ibid. 146.
Mazar has also excavated several water installations she attributes to the Hasmonean and Herodian periods (538 BCE- 70 CE). Although Duncan and Macalister had previously excavated many of these structures, Mazar’s work has helped to confirm the dates traditionally attributed to these installations. These include a ritual bath, or mikveh, recorded at the centre of the excavation area, coins from within its walls dating to the reign of Alexander Jannaeaus (103 BCE- 76 BCE), and a ‘plastered vaulted chamber’ (2.55x 1.55. m.) found just north of the mikveh within which a coin Mazar attributes to the second year of the First Jewish Revolt (67/ 68 CE) has been recovered. Coupled with the aforementioned ‘double cistern’ (Fig.8), Mazar’s excavations provide evidence that the area was still in use during the 1st century CE whilst reaffirming Duncan and Macalister’s original dating of the water installations.

Mazar also uncovered remains from the Second Temple Period that incorporated walls attributed to the ‘Large Stone Structure’. Of note the unearthing of a compartmentalized cistern at the extreme west of Mazar’s excavation area, labeled the ‘arched cistern’ in 2005 and then the ‘double cistern’ in Mazar’s 2007 publication. Previously documented by Duncan and Macalister, whose records show the sections of the cistern were connected via a stone arched roof, Mazar notes that the arch of the ‘double cistern’ was in fact built into the western portion of W107. Yet intriguingly Mazar also proposes that the cistern was hewn during the ‘earliest occupational phases of this area’ and was incorporated into the ‘Large Stone Structure’ to be subsequently used continuously in the preceding periods.

The ‘House of Eusebius’, again first excavated by Duncan and Macalister, was also shown by Mazar to include an additional room. When compared to other
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examples of Byzantine architecture at the foot of the Haram al- Sharif\textsuperscript{395}, Duncan and Macalister’s original 4\textsuperscript{th}/7\textsuperscript{th} century CE attribution is confirmed. Additionally Mazar also revealed that the latest construction at the site, a round pool, occurred toward the end of the Umayyad or Abbasid period (8\textsuperscript{th} - 10\textsuperscript{th} century CE) while the latest ceramic evidence from the site dates to the second half of the 8\textsuperscript{th} - 11\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE or Fatimid period\textsuperscript{396}.

5E) Alternative Interpretations and Current Debates.

With Mazar’s dating and descriptions of the material evidence presented, it is now possible to examine alternative analyses in order to examine various claims regarding the ‘Large Stone Structure’ as logically possible. By focusing upon several key features of Mazar’s excavations and arguments, specifically those relating to the ‘brown earth accumulation’ directly beneath the ‘Large Stone Structure’ and the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ to the south, both the alternative conclusions regarding these features will be presented alongside Mazar’s own conclusions and historical interpretations.

Although discussed in chapter four (4C) it is important to briefly outline Mazar’s use of the biblical narrative in guiding her research. Mazar hypothesized prior to excavation that the ‘Fortress of Zion’, known only from biblical accounts, must have acted as a fortification to support the northern limits of the settlement during the 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE. Assured of the historicity of the biblical narrative, Mazar therefore concluded that because 2 Samuel 5: 17 explains that ‘David went down to the stronghold’ his Palace must have been located north of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’, a terrace that excavator Yigal Shiloh and others have suggested was erected to support the as yet unexcavated ‘Fortress of Zion’ built atop the ridge\textsuperscript{397}.

\textsuperscript{395} E. Mazar 2003, et al.
\textsuperscript{396} E. Mazar 2009, 98.
\textsuperscript{397} Shiloh 1984, 26. See also Maeir 2000, 52.
5F) The ‘Brown Earth Accumulation’

Regarding the ‘brown earth accumulation’, directly underneath W107 and W20, Mazar’s proposal that the area covered by the layer was located outside the city, as well as the prospect that it represents long-term activity in the 2nd millennium BCE\(^\text{398}\), has been contested. On the topic of 10th century Jerusalem’s northern limits early excavators Duncan and Macalister concluded that the city was forced to terminate at a decline running east to west across the northern ridge, a depression they titled the ‘Zedek Valley’\(^\text{399}\). Following this hypothesis Mazar ignores evidence from Kenyon’s excavations that suggest that the northern fortifications of settlement during the 10th century were located further to the north\(^\text{400}\).

Furthermore Kenyon revealed evidence to refute the proposal that the ‘Zedek Valley’ was a natural feature, showing that although the contours of ridge indicated an east/west decline, the bedrock along the crest in fact rises toward the north\(^\text{401}\). Finkelstein and Herzog also point out that considering the choice of a ridge for settlement was primarily driven by defensive concerns both find Mazar’s proposals unlikely, as her hypothesis sees the ‘Fortress of Zion’ constructed on a slope, dominated by higher ground from the continuation of the ridge to the north\(^\text{402}\).

Concerning the date attributed to the creation of ‘brown earth accumulation’ and whether or not it can be considered an \textit{in situ} stratum, Mazar’s conclusion that the layer was deposited no later then the Iron I appears accurate. From the material evidence presented Mazar has shown that ‘the fill was mixed with large quantities of datable pottery sherds’, ranging from the Middle Bronze Age to the Iron Age I\(^\text{403}\). Yet because these sherds were not delineated into specific strata it remains impossible to determine whether the ‘brown earth accumulation’ was formed as a result of long-term activity

\(^{399}\) Duncan & Macalister 1926, 15. See also E. Mazar 2007, 28.
\(^{400}\) Steiner 2001, 12- 14.
\(^{401}\) Ibid. 37.
\(^{403}\) E. Mazar 2006a, 25.
during the 2nd millennium BCE as Mazar suggests, or whether it was instead brought to the site as a fill for the purposes of laying the foundations for a building and/or fortifications\textsuperscript{404}. As Mazar has also described the unfortified site as an ‘open, flat area, a testimony to the careful planning invested in its creation’\textsuperscript{405}, it would appear that even she believes the ‘brown earth accumulation’ was placed there with intent.

Although the ‘brown earth accumulation’ is likely ‘not an in situ accumulation, but rather a fill-debris that was brought to this location from somewhere else on the crest of the ridge’\textsuperscript{406}, it is important to highlight the fact that while Mazar dates the layer to no later then Iron I the data presented only provides the time after which the ‘Large Stone Structure’ above it could have been built. As a result while Mazar’s conclusions regarding the ‘brown earth accumulation’ are accurate her use of this information to date the foundations excavated above remains problematic. Since no material evidence directly linked to the walls of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ to corroborate her findings have as yet been published, the ‘brown earth accumulation’ offers only a \textit{terminus post quem} for the walls above and not a precise date for their construction.

Although the majority of the pottery sherds recorded by Mazar from within the ‘brown earth accumulation’ were dated to the Early and Middle Iron I\textsuperscript{407} this conclusion has been contested due to the presence of floral remains dating to the Iron IIA. Based on radiocarbon dating tests performed upon two olive pits and a bone from the ‘brown earth accumulation’ alternative dates for the assemblage have been proposed\textsuperscript{408}, with the results from one of the olive pits indicating it was deposited either between 1000- 890 BCE or 870- 840 BCE\textsuperscript{409}. Both date ranges fall outside the period traditionally attributed to David’s reign\textsuperscript{410}, however, since only one olive pit dating from this period has been

\textsuperscript{404} Kenyon 1963, 18
\textsuperscript{405} E. Mazar 2006a, 25.
\textsuperscript{406} Finkelstein, Herzog, Singer- Avitz & Ussishkin 2007, 149.
\textsuperscript{407} E. Mazar 2006b, 11- 12.
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thus far recorded it may simply be an intrusive or contaminated find that was deposited through occupation of the area during Iron IIA.

**5G) The Walls of the ‘Large Stone Structure’**

Considering this adjustment to the date of deposition for the ‘brown earth accumulation’, Mazar’s conclusions regarding the ‘Large Stone Structure’ must also be re-evaluated, as they are partially based upon the fact that the latest pottery recorded from the layer beneath the proposed palace was believed to be from around the 10th century BCE. Furthermore Wall 107 requires re-examination based on structural inconsistencies in its direction, assembly and date, separate from those presented by the ‘brown earth accumulation’. Essentially it is possible to separate Wall 107 into two separate stages of construction, with a structurally sound western section and a crumbling irregularly constructed eastern section. For instance, the western portion of Wall 107 is constructed in a straight line with sizable, cut stone blocks aligned with their headers forming the surface of the wall.

In contrast, the eastern segment of Wall 107 is constructed haphazardly, consisting of smaller stone blocks placed lengthwise and running diagonally northwest from Wall 20 to meet the western section. Aside from their structural differences some of the stones comprising the eastern extreme of W107 have been built over the northeastern corner of the cistern Mazar dated to between the 1st century BCE and 1st century CE. Due to the variation in the size of the blocks used, their orientation and the inclusion of the ‘Second Temple Period’ cistern by the eastern part of Wall 107, rather then a single wall it appears there are in fact two separate walls (Fig. 9). Yet although it has been proposed that the eastern section of W107 should be dated no earlier then the 1st century BCE, in accordance with the Herodian era cistern beneath it, the well-built western wall’s date of construction remains unclear.
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Regarding the proposed extension to the north of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ again debate continues as to whether the pottery from Locus 47 should be attributed to Room C. Foremost is the concern that none of the pottery objects were found intact or connected to a securely dated floor, as the fragmentary state of the various jugs, bowls and kraters is a clear indication that they were not found in situ (Emphasis Original). Additionally radiocarbon test results published by E. Mazar on a bone recovered from Locus 47 suggests it was deposited between ca. 930- 800 BCE, while the presence of pottery sherds dating to this same period (Iron IIB) within Locus 47 have not been used to date the deposition of the assemblage but rather to support Mazar’s argument that the locus had been ‘exposed’ following the siege of Nebuchadnezzar in 597 BCE.

Since pottery dated to Iron IIB was also found in the upper fraction of Locus 47 again it could be suggested that rather then an in situ deposit the fragments recovered from Room C were removed from primary context. In fact, although Mazar originally interpreted the ‘badly worn’ state of these fragments as indicating that they ‘came from the very end of Iron Age I’, she has since concluded that the ‘state of preservation of the vessels suggests that they were at some nearby location prior to the construction of W22’ and that they ‘somehow were deposited at this spot when the walls were built’. That Mazar clearly divided sherds from the lower portions of Locus 47, the Iron IIA assemblage containing an ivory blade and a Black-on-Red Cypriot juglet, from those dating to the Iron IIB (8th - 6th century BCE) within the upper layer of the locus further suggests a later date should be assigned to Wall 22, if not the entire ‘Large Stone Structure’.
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As this dating was also based upon the fact that Mazar believes the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ was built in connection and concurrently with Wall 20, the former supporting the later, an examination of this architectural feature will again highlight the discrepancies between the evidence available and the conclusions reached. Based on her findings Mazar has concluded that Wall 20 connects with the apex of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure and that the development of both occurred during the first phase of construction undertaken in the mid-10th century BCE.

5H) The Dating and Composition of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’

Dubbed the ‘Jebusite Ramp’ by Duncan and Macalister during their 1925 excavations of the area, Mazar’s dating of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ to the 10th century BCE comprises one of her primary arguments for attributing the ‘Large Stone Structure’ to this same period. However, as numerous scholars have examined this architectural feature, a discussion of its structure and date of construction must be presented, as evidence suggests that the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ underwent several phases of improvement and redevelopment. Needless to say Duncan and Macalister’s dating of the ‘Jebusite Ramp’ has been categorically dismissed, with recent data published by Steiner and Cahill further adding to the corpus of evidence against the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ having been entirely constructed in the 10th/9th century BCE.

Essentially Mazar proposes that Wall 20, the eastern wall of the ‘Large Stone Structure’, was bonded to the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’, further suggesting therefore that the later was either built prior to or alongside the former. Yet despite the fact that there is evidence to support suggestions that lower portions of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ were constructed as early as the 13th century BCE, Shiloh and Kenyon also concluded that several buildings they both independently dated to the 7th century BCE (Iron IIB),
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including the ‘Burnt Room’ and the ‘House of Ahiel’, had been built atop this portion of the ‘Structure’\(^{428}\). Furthermore several pottery sherds recovered from between the stones comprising this lower portion of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ date to the Iron IIA\(^{429}\).

Hence, although there is no evidence to suggest that the upper portion of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ was erected during the period encompassing David’s reign, the lower section(s) of the ‘Structure’ should be dated to before the 8\(^{th}/7\(^{th}\) century BCE on account of the pottery sherds published by Steiner and the buildings erected upon it, the latter having been almost universally accepted as Iron IIB era structures\(^{430}\). The exception to this traditional position has been presented by Cahill, who in a reexamination of finds relating to the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ concludes that pottery from Shiloh’s Strata 14 and 13, dating to roughly the 10\(^{th}/9\(^{th}\) century BCE, was found upon floor of the ‘Burnt Room’s’ lower level\(^{431}\).

Yet as Cahill cited only sherds dating to the 10\(^{th}/9\(^{th}\) century BCE and no complete vessels it is likely that these fragments had been recycled in order to create a foundation for the 8\(^{th}/7\(^{th}\) century BCE structure above (‘Burnt Room’), particularly as the sherds Cahill refers were recorded as originating from ten different loci\(^{432}\). This evidence rather then establishing an Iron I origin for the ‘Burnt Room’ instead indicates only that pottery sherds dating to the 10\(^{th}/9\(^{th}\) century BCE were recycled in order to form the floor of this building. Apart from the later sherds published by Steiner the fact that no pottery from Strata 14 and 13 was recovered from the ‘Burnt Room’ by prior excavations reinforces the established provenience\(^{433}\).

Mazar’s hypothesis that the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ and the ‘Large Stone Structure’ were ‘part of a single, enormous building complex’ built in a late phase of the Iron Age I ‘at the earliest’ must be reassessed, particularly since it has been shown that
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the upper portions of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ underwent at least two phases of development. Considering both Kenyon and Shiloh dated the houses built atop the lower portion to the 7th century, this provides at least the earliest date this section of the terrace system could have been built, however, it is also from evidence uncovered by both these excavators that the latest construction date can be determined.

Initially revealed by Kenyon, further evidence recorded by Shiloh has shown that the upper portion of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ were incorporated into the fortifications running along the eastern ridge, the walls and towers Mazar suggests integrated her Wall 20. Yet as Kenyon also concluded that ‘all the constructions following the line of the eastern crest of the eastern ridge belong to the post-Exilic-Hellenistic-Maccabean period’, Mazar’s use of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ to reaffirm her dating of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ must be reassessed. Since Shiloh also noted that ‘the line of the ‘First Wall’ and its towers integrated the top of the stepped stone structure’, it can be concluded that the upper portion of the ‘Stepped Stone Structure’ was built no later than the late Hellenistic period.

5I) The Proto-Aeolic Capital and Accompanying Ashlar Masonry

Mazar’s conclusions regarding the proto-Aeolic capital originally recovered by Kathleen Kenyon also remain uncertain, as both Kenyon and later Yigal Shiloh dated the capital and accompanying ashlar masonry to after the reign of King David (1010-970 BCE). Although the origins of the Proto-Aeolic style in architecture has been dated to Late Bronze Age Egypt (1550-1200 BCE), it is telling that Kenyon reached similar conclusions to those made by Mazar, independently proposing that ‘a building of some considerable pretensions stood on top of the scarp’. Yet Kenyon cautiously dates the Proto-Aeolic capital to the 5th-3rd century BCE on account of the
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deposits above it while analysis by Shiloh attributed the ashlar masonry and capital to after the time of David, dating the finds to the 9th century BCE based on his study of the development of the Proto-Aeolic style in Israel.

Mazar builds her case for the Jerusalem capital having once been connected to W20 by comparisons with similar finds from across modern Israel, including Samaria, Megiddo, and Ramat Rachel. However the Proto- Aeolic capitals from Ramat Rachel adorned a building attributed to the 7th century BCE and the capitals from Samaria and Megiddo have been dated to no earlier than the 9th century BCE, confirming Shiloh’s original conclusions. Thus, Mazar’s attribution of the capital to King David’s Palace remains unlikely.

Palaces excavated at Samaria and Megiddo when compared to the ‘Large Stone Structure’ further illustrate that the foundations Mazar has unearthed are not those of a palace. Structurally the walls of Building Period I at Samaria and Palace 6000 at Megiddo were either partially or completely constructed of ashlar masonry, while an enclosure linked to Building Period I and a porch of Palace 1723 were both adorned with Proto- Aeolic capitals. The internal layout of all three palaces also differs from the arrangement of the ‘Large Stone Structure’, and while Mazar initially suggested similarities between the ‘Large Stone Structure’ and Palace 1723 confirmed her palatial hypothesis, she has since conceded that for the former ‘no plan could be reconstructed for it yet’. Furthermore, although debate continues as to the precise dating of several structures connected to both Building Period I at Samaria and
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Palace 1723 at Megiddo, none have yet proposed a date earlier than the 9th century BCE for either of these structures.

Mazar’s argument that the foundations of the walls she attributes to the ‘Large Stone Structure’ are representative of 10th/9th century BCE palatial architecture is therefore shown to be inaccurate when compared to the well-documented palaces from Samaria and Megiddo449. Furthermore parallels drawn between the ‘Large Stone Structure’ and Near Eastern palatial architecture, specifically the Bit Hilani and LAP designs, are not reflected in the material evidence recorded by Mazar. Again this illustrates the fact that regardless of their construction date the foundations Mazar has excavated prove only a structure existed here and say nothing of purpose or functionality, with any links to King David or the palace believed to be built for him by Hiram of Tyre (2 Samuel 5:11) existing exclusively within the pages of the Deuteronomistic History.

Conclusions

Having shown that the archaeological evidence for the ‘Large Stone Structure’ as published by Mazar shows no proof of either a palace or walls firmly datable to the 10th century BCE, alternatives must be sought. Considering that Mazar dated the latest pottery sherds found in connection to the ‘Large Stone Structure’ to the 8th-6th century BCE, the walls comprising it should be attributed to the Iron Age IIB. Mazar’s argument that the Proto-Aeolic capital found below W20 was a part of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ also supports this conclusion, as the Jerusalem capital has the most similarities with examples found at Ramat Rachel dating to the 7th century BCE450. Based on the fact that not more secure evidence to date the walls of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ have been yet published, the walls that comprise the building should be dated to between the 8th-6th centuries BCE.
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As for the function of these walls the proposed connection between fortifications identified by Kenyon’s excavations to the north and the ‘Large Stone Structure’ suggests defense. Since the primary wall of the building (W107) is likely two separate structures this also implies that rather than a single feature Mazar has rather excavated several, with Room E and Room D showing further building activity across the site. Furthermore Mazar’s argument that the area the ‘Large Stone Structure’ was built upon may have served as a gathering place or market, on account of the animal bones a vegetable remains recovered from the ‘Brown Earth Accumulation’, hints at a purpose for the enclosed ‘Chalk Floor but not for the ‘Large Stone Structure’ above.

Unfortunately due simply to a lack of quantifiable evidence to support any theory, all interpretations of the material evidence thus far excavated at the ‘City of David’ remain improvable. Apart from the conclusions offered above the evidence to suggest any economic, administrative or even military activity does not exist, with what little that is datable showing the site was not developed until the Iron Age IIB, several centuries after David’s reign (1010-970 BCE). As a result there is nothing from the archaeological evidence provided by Eilat Mazar or any prior excavators of the site that suggests the walls comprising the ‘Large Stone Structure’ should be interpreted as having once functioned as King David’s Palace.
Chapter Six
Politics and Archaeology in Israel
Ideology, Patronage and the Existence of King David’s Palace.

This chapter aims to examine the social context within which Eilat Mazar’s archaeological conclusions have been formed. As the existence of King David and the United Monarchy has been linked with modern Israel since the state was formed in 1948, archaeological evidence that does not support the Deuteronomistic History is often met with opposition. While many modern scholars have accepted that the Old Testament is not entirely factual, the organizations that fund Mazar’s excavations do so in order to promote their own social, political and ideological agendas, with archaeology serving as but one means of strengthening their arguments for Israel being and having always been a Jewish state.

The following chapter therefore explores through popular media sources and an examination of these organizations the ideological links between Mazar and her patrons, the Ir David Foundation and the Shalem Center. The wider politicization of archaeology within Jerusalem will also be discussed to further highlight the social context surrounding Mazar’s conclusions.

6A) Biblical Archaeology, Zionism and the State of Modern Israel

Though often demonized by those opposed to Israel as a Jewish state, Zionism is a belief in the existence of a Jewish state that encompasses the political gamut. However, just as archaeology can be politicized so too has Zionism been used to bolster various political agendas across the region. In fact archaeology has always played a significant
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role in the promotion of Zionism\textsuperscript{457}. The swearing-in ceremony of recruits who have just completed their Israel Defense Force basic training (\textit{Tironut}) aims to highlight the perceived links between the struggles facing the modern state and the Sacarii rebels who committed suicide rather than surrender to the forces of Lucius Flavius Silva in 72 CE\textsuperscript{458}.

First identified in 1848 and later excavated between 1963 and 1965 by Yigael Yadin\textsuperscript{459}, Masada was one of several sites including Jericho and Megiddo\textsuperscript{460} that for over a century had helped reinforce a Jewish presence in the land. Considering such luminaries as William F. Albright had consistently published finds that appeared to correspond to the stories of the Old Testament\textsuperscript{461}, when in 1948 the State of Israel’s Proclamation of Independence was declared it spoke of the need for Jews to ‘re-establish themselves in their ancient homeland’\textsuperscript{462}, linking the modern nation to the kingdom founded by King David\textsuperscript{463}.

With methodological shifts in academia and improvements in archaeological techniques, aided significantly by advances in the ‘hard sciences’, including radiocarbon dating and thermoluminescence tests\textsuperscript{464}, doubts regarding the historicity of the biblical narrative began to emerge, ultimately resulting in a revision of the conclusions originally proposed by the forefathers of Biblical Archaeology\textsuperscript{465}. Yet despite the stories of Noah’s Ark, Exodus and even Joshua’s conquest of Canaan having now been accepted by most archaeologists as not accurately representing the regions’ history\textsuperscript{466}, recent doubts concerning both the existence of King David and the United Monarchy have also had a greater political impact\textsuperscript{467}.
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An essential component of traditional Zionism is the idea that the modern state of Israel is a continuation of David’s original kingdom and that Jerusalem was the capital of this ancient state. For instance the biblical narrative relates that King David, who renames the site the ‘City of David’, conquered the ‘Fortress of Zion’ (2 Samuel 5:7) and as a result, according to Rabbi Yehuda Mali, vice president of the Ir David Foundation, ‘Zion is the central place for the entire Jewish people’. Hence traditional interpretations of Zionism are linked with not simply Jerusalem but the site of the ‘Fortress of Zion’, which David was said to have seized.

It is therefore no surprise to find that reaction to a group of scholars who denied the historicity of King David, suggesting he is ‘no more historical than King Arthur’, was largely hostile. Dubbed the ‘Copenhagen School’ during the 1990s these scholars began to argue that the archaeological evidence had not yet been recovered to adequately confirm the existence of King David. The publication of *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology’s New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origins of its Sacred Texts* and *David and Solomon: In Search of the Bible's Sacred Kings and the Roots of the Western Tradition* by Neil Asher Silberman and Israel Finkelstein likewise saw both scholars criticized as ‘anti-Semitic’ by their opponents, despite both author’s suggesting that David was in fact a historical figure, simply not as the Old Testament describes.

The increase of archaeological work questioning the existence of King David however has also led to the growth across the Middle East in a reassessment of the Deuteronomistic History, a shift that has in some cases led to a complete denial of a Jewish historical connection to the land. Referred to as ‘Temple Denial’ by the
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international media, as much of the debate revolves around archaeology of the Haram al- Sharif (also referred to as the Temple Mount), the theory has grown in popularity over the past two decades. Several Palestinian scholars including Hamed Salem of Bir Zeit University and Hani Nur el-Din of Al Quds University have argued that as archaeology has yet to produce proof to support the Old Testament the biblical narrative should be considered purely fictional. Moreover the Al Quds university website denies the possibility of a Jewish temple at the site, stating that the Al- Aqsa compound, located atop the Haram al- Sharif following the Muslim conquest of Jerusalem in 637 AD, ‘cannot possibly be in the same place as the first or second temple’. In response to E. Mazar’s conclusions regarding King David’s Palace Hani Nur el- Din further contends that while Israeli archaeology has certainly focused on the biblical narrative such studies are also used for political ends, reinforcing the concept of Israel as a Jewish state.

While some Muslim academics, anxious about the future of the site have tried to argue against Jewish historical claims to the Haram al- Sharif through lack of material evidence, the fact that organizations such as the Ir David Foundation have been accused of using archaeology to undermine current Palestinian claims to property and land shows that neither side is above manipulating scholarship to bolster their individual ideological agendas. Furthermore Silberman argues that a wide range of popular publications, including brochures and guidebooks relating the archaeology of Jerusalem often provide a biased view, offering a ‘narrative that is far more sweeping in its conclusions and implications than the specific archaeological data on which it is ultimately based’. Hence the debate concerning the Haram al- Sharif is a prime example of the dangers of the politicization of archaeological research, for when used to
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‘assert mutually exclusive claims, archaeological evidence ignores the other and its narrative.’

6B) Eilat Mazar: Modern Politics, Ancient Palaces and Biblical Archaeology.

Reports relating to Eilat Mazar’s findings have appeared in papers internationally since the mid-1980s, with coverage increasing considerably following several articles relating Mazar’s discovery of the structure she concluded partly comprised King David’s Palace. These articles have tended to focus on the links between Mazar’s finds and the biblical narrative, often approaching the evidence presented without considering the historical validity of David or the United Monarchy. For example several articles run with headlines that suggest confirmation of the biblical narrative, ‘Biblical Accuracy Supported By New Evidence’ and ‘Ruin Shows King Solomon Was Real’.

While this often reflects the ideology of the stories’ editors rather than the writer, such reportage only works to confirm conclusions that academics continue to debate. Likewise several articles covering Mazar’s work are sourced from wire service and consequently truncated, often editing out the arguments of dissenting scholars and critics due to publishing costs and space considerations. When published in the popular press Mazar’s work is therefore presented as if authoritative rather then an opinion amidst many, essentially isolating the public from the continuing scholarly discourse.

For example, since the first articles concerning Eilat Mazar’s work at the ‘City of David’ site were published throughout 2005, Mazar has made several claims linking
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material evidence to biblical personas, again highlighting her emphasis on the Bible as a historical source. In February 2010 for instance, Mazar proclaimed that a wall dating back to the time of Solomon had been unearthed\textsuperscript{496}, however, this interpretation is inaccurate since the evidence cannot be firmly attributed to any ruler, let alone a specific monarch from the Old Testament\textsuperscript{497}. And while some finds from Mazar’s excavations do support the historicity of individuals referenced in the Old Testament, for example the Yehuchal ben Shelemayahu and Gedalyahu ben Pashhur sealings discussed below, Mazar's attribution of a bulla to the ‘Temech’ family highlights the dangers of not only text-based interpretations but also bias in both archaeological research and subsequent media coverage\textsuperscript{498}.

Included amongst the finds from her initial 2005 excavations Mazar’s discovery of a single bulla was heralded by the media as confirmation of the Bible’s accuracy\textsuperscript{499}, for upon the seal impression was the name Yehuchal ben Shelemayahu, an official under King Hezekiah and referred in passages from the Bible (Jeremiah 38:1)\textsuperscript{500}. The subsequent excavation of another bulla, also containing the name of a royal official, Gedalyahu ben Pashhur, was again presented by the media as evidence that the biblical narrative contained a degree of historically accurate information\textsuperscript{501}. Yet following an interview concerning a third bulla, this seal attributed by Mazar to the ‘Temech’ family and presented as further proof of the historicity of the biblical narrative, other academics began to raise concerns\textsuperscript{502}. Although Mazar has consequently adjusted her reading from ‘Temech’ to ‘Shlomit’ the issue is not that her interpretations were incorrect but rather that neither the author, editor nor Mazar personally confirmed the ‘Temech’ reading prior to the publication of these conclusions, further distancing the public from the academic discourse and the contrary views of Mazar’s scholastic peers.
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Despite the personal biases of editors, writers and the publications employing them, media coverage of Mazar’s findings provide insight into the approach she has taken toward her excavations, the importance of the Bible in guiding her work, as well as the reactions from scholarly contemporaries to these conclusions. Reportage relating to her discovery of King David’s Palace for instance reveals Mazar’s reliance upon the biblical narrative, emphasizing her academic objectivity by adding that this does not see her ‘give up even the least bit of technical excavation or research’.

Mazar’s arguments that the Bible should remain a vital tool for Israeli archaeology, as it remains one of the only source of information pertaining to the region in the 10th century BCE, is not unfounded. Rather than simply ‘giving the Bible's version a chance’ as she proposes, Mazar’s approach instead places undue emphasis on the accuracy of the biblical narrative and interprets finds based on literal interpretations of the Old Testament. Despite these assertions, Mazar has admitted that her faith in the historicity of the Bible is not without doubts, suggesting in a 2005 article for The Washington Post that there ‘is sometimes a reality, a very precise reality, though maybe not all true, described in the Bible’.

Mazar’s personal stance toward archaeological issues has been made clear through the publicity of the causes she has supported. Aside from her criticisms of collectors and the publication of unprovenienced antiquities, the two major disputes Mazar was frequently quoted in relation to both involve archaeological issues surrounding the Haram al-Sharif. The first debate began when reports that the Islamic Trust (Waqf) overseeing the site planned to excavate for the future construction of a mosque, causing Mazar and several likeminded academics and political figures, such
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as former Mayor of Jerusalem Teddy Kollek\textsuperscript{510}, to form the Israeli Committee for the Prevention of the Destruction of Antiquities on the Temple Mount (ICPTM)\textsuperscript{511}. While letters and appeals to halt the construction were sent to successive prime ministers all went reportedly unheeded\textsuperscript{512}, however, Mazar’s stances against the Waqf in her role as spokeswoman for the ICPTM highlighted her attitude toward not only the restriction of excavation within Jerusalem, but also her conviction that First Temple remains exist within the Haram al-Sharif\textsuperscript{513}.

Suggesting in a February 2001 report by The Jerusalem Post that the ‘intention of Islamic authorities is to transform the entire complex, underground as well as above ground, into an Islamic prayer shrine’ Mazar goes on to accuse the Waqf of working toward a future where ‘Jewish connections to the site are erased’\textsuperscript{514}. Islamic officials, however, have consistently rejected these arguments, instead suggesting that the issue ‘is about politics and nothing else’; although in the same article Waqf director Adnan Al-Husseini proposes that ‘no stones are there from the Temple Mount’\textsuperscript{515}, reinforcing Mazar’s suggestion that ‘no one in the Wakf or the Palestinian Authority is willing to recognize that the Temple Mount carries any historic value for anyone except themselves’\textsuperscript{516}.

The fact that the Waqf continue to deny Israeli archaeologists the opportunity to excavate the site suggests this argument has merit, particularly since unprovenienced finds recovered from dirt removed from the area beneath the Haram al-Sharif have revealed material from several periods, including Roman, Byzantine and even bullet casings from the First World War\textsuperscript{517}. Supporting this stance in an interview for Access Middle East, Mazar again asserts that ‘pretending, making declarations doesn’t help’ as
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the ‘stones do not understand politics’. Considering these excavations of the Haram al-Sharif are not the only archaeological issue related to the site, or Jerusalem in general, that has caused widespread debate, even threats of violence, underscores the inherently political nature of archaeology within the state of Israel.

For example Mazar has been quoted in relation to several other contentious issues surrounding the Haram al-Sharif, ranging from the length of time visitors have to wait for admission, to the construction of the Mughrabi Gate bridge, through to the ‘Battle of the Bulge’, with all three issues placing Mazar at odds with the Islamic Waqf and prominently in the media spotlight. Personal politics and bias notwithstanding, these debates surrounding not only the historicity of the biblical narrative but Jewish rights to excavate sites, clearly inform Mazar’s publicly expressed attitudes toward both the excavation of contentious sites as well as the practice by Palestinian scholars of revisionist or theologically biased interpretations.

Despite media coverage of Eilat Mazar’s finds and interpretations relating to the ‘City of David’ often omitting the arguments of her detractors, it is important to stress that Mazar’s conclusions have not received widespread support from her academic contemporaries. For instance, with regard to the Palace of King David, although most agree that the find is worthy of further study, Mazar’s dating and identification of the structure has been questioned. Professor Israeli Finkelstein, chair of the Department of Archaeology at Tel Aviv University (1994-1998), for example has called Mazar’s palace theories yet another in a series of ‘messianic explosions in biblical archaeology’, arguing that the ‘Bible is an important source but we cannot take it seriously’.

In an interview with Dave Davies on the Fresh Air radio program (US National Public Radio, May 15th 2006), Neil Asher Silberman, archaeologist and co-author with
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Finkelstein of two popular works relating to the historicity of the Old Testament\textsuperscript{525}, warns listeners to ‘beware of spectacular discoveries that promise to prove that everything is true’. Silberman suggests that rather than the structure uncovered by Mazar confirming King David’s historicity, as ‘there are no inscriptions, there's nothing that tells us that this large building was anything to David’, it is simply ‘another piece of the puzzle that must be combined with the general picture in Jerusalem’\textsuperscript{526}.

\textbf{6C) The Shalem Center: Patrons, Pundits and Politics.}

Founded in 1994, the Jerusalem based Shalem Center is a right wing organization that aims to promote Israel’s sovereignty and its existence as a Jewish state\textsuperscript{527}. According to their website, the Shalem Center’s mission is to ‘reassert Israel’s connection to the land’ while also reinforcing traditional Zionist values\textsuperscript{528}. David Polisar, the Shalem Center’s president, likewise emphasizes the importance of Biblical Archaeology in this endeavor, listing it alongside ‘democratic theory’ and ‘social policy’ as one of ‘the areas most crucial to the public life of the Jewish people’\textsuperscript{529}.

Published by Shalem Press, \textit{Azure} is one of two journals produced by the Shalem Center. Articles frequently presented first in \textit{Azure} are subsequently reprinted in newspapers both within Israel and internationally. An article published in 2005 by David Hazony discussing the ‘City of David’ excavations for example also appeared in the October 20\textsuperscript{th} issue of the Canadian Jewish News\textsuperscript{530}, and while wholly supportive of the conclusions regarding a Palace of King David, neither the evidence or arguments that counter Mazar’s claims were included. Similarly an article published in \textit{The New York Sun} is also sympathetic to Mazar’s proposals\textsuperscript{531}, with the absence of contrary opinions again highlighting the bias of publications controlled either directly by the Shalem Center or their senior members.
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\textsuperscript{530} Hazony 2005, 11.
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As outlined by Bell, opinion or ‘op-ed’ pieces are the most effective forms of text for displaying an author’s ideology, and it is through a brief analysis of such articles by senior Shalem members that the conservative values of the organization can be highlighted. Several ‘op-ed’ pieces by Daniel Gordis, senior vice president of the Shalem Center, and Michael Oren, former Shalem Center vice-president and current Israeli Ambassador to Washington, highlight the conservative stance taken by leading members of the organization.

Issues covered by Gordis range from the increasing irrelevance of traditional Zionist teachings for modern Israelis through to the lack of ‘meaningful public discourse’ regarding the state’s borders and relations with the United States, while Oren’s articles for The New York Times and The New Republic concern the historical and political impact of Israel as a Jewish state. The issues discussed by Oren and Gordis, particularly those of loyalty oaths and Palestinian recognition of Israel as a Jewish state, are also primary concerns for members of Israel’s ruling coalition, led by Benjamin Netanyahu, further illustrating the conservative nature of the politics of the Shalem Center.

That Gordis also attacks freedom of speech in Israel, arguing no country at war maintains the same liberties as ‘countries not facing existential threat can permit themselves’, is indicative of the group’s politics. Coupled with articles supporting Jewish settlement in East Jerusalem and decrying the perceived irrelevance of Zionism to modern American Jews, the conservative ideology and approach of the Shalem Center becomes much clearer. In addition to newspaper and journal articles, the Shalem Center promotes its conservative ideals through a number of educational endeavors, including
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the recently announced ‘Shalem College’\textsuperscript{539}, the publication of Eilat Mazar’s preliminary 2005 excavations report\textsuperscript{540} and the financing of projects complementary to the organizations ideology.

In 2002 the Shalem Centre opted to provide such funding to several Jewish academics interested in publishing journals similar in scope and production quality to \textit{Azure}, the Shalem Center’s English language journal, and its Hebrew sister publication \textit{Techelet}\textsuperscript{541}. The fact that once each publication was founded the Shalem Center had no more involvement in the process is admirable, however, through supporting journals that were intended to promote values similar to their own, the organization again reveals its ideological stance whilst also increasing the influence/public exposure of these ideals.

Conversely the reaction of Daniel Gordis to a series of protests against Michael Oren when the later was speaking at Columbia University is indicative of the conservative hard-line approach taken by the organization to those they perceive as opponents. Responding to articles condemning Oren as a figure several students considered ‘politically divisive’\textsuperscript{542}, referring to his statements of support for ‘Operation: Cast Lead’\textsuperscript{543} and the Israeli occupation of Gaza\textsuperscript{544}, Gordis launched an attack on not only those who opposed Oren’s address but also students supporting the Ambassador. Citing their failure to defend Israel’s actions in their responses to Oren’s opponents, Gordis is unforgiving in criticizing those unsupportive of Israeli governmental policies yet claiming to be pro-Israeli, a problem he perceives as a general weakness inherent in modern American Jewry\textsuperscript{545}. That this attitude is directed toward even those who supported Oren’s Columbia address again highlights the conservative, uncompromising position adopted by senior members of the Shalem Center.

\textsuperscript{539} Jager 2009, 22. See also Selig 2010a, 6.
\textsuperscript{540} E. Mazar 2007, 7-8.
\textsuperscript{541} Green 2006, 38.
\textsuperscript{542} Gordis 2010d, 8.
\textsuperscript{543} ‘Operation: Cast Lead’ is the name given to the IDF campaign into the Gaza Strip that commenced on December 27\textsuperscript{th}, 2008.
\textsuperscript{544} Oren & Klein Halevi 2008, A13.
\textsuperscript{545} Russo 2009, 18.
6D) The Shalem Center and Archaeology in Israel

The importance and dependence of Eilat Mazar’s ‘City of David’ excavations upon funds contributed by the Shalem Centre and the senior members of the organization are clearly outlined in three separate publications written by Mazar between 2006-2009\textsuperscript{546}. Specifically in both her preliminary excavation reports (published in 2007 and 2009) Mazar emphasizes the fact that despite having authored two articles, one in Hebrew in 1996 and another in English the following year\textsuperscript{547}, both stressing the site’s ‘archaeological potential’, her attempts to secure financing for the project were ‘to no avail’\textsuperscript{548}. The links between her work and the Shalem Centre are subsequently highlighted when Mazar explains that ‘real progress’ was made only upon her becoming a senior fellow at the Centre\textsuperscript{549}. Daniel Polisar, Shalem Centre president, and Yishai Haetzni, Shalem’s executive director, both reportedly ‘hastened to find financial support for the expedition’ following a lecture Mazar presented detailing her theories, ultimately securing funds from Roger and Suzan Hertog in 2005 that allowed excavation to commence\textsuperscript{550}.

That Mazar was unable to secure financing to excavate for more than a decade until joining the Shalem Centre clearly highlights the fact that her theories were not widely accepted by academic institutions or philanthropic organizations. That only upon accepting a senior fellowship with the Shalem Centre were her proposals noted by senior members of the organization, despite her 1996/1997 publications and subsequent attempts to promote said theories, also suggests Mazar’s ties to Shalem were vital for appropriating the money she required to excavate.

As a result the Shalem Center has supported Mazar’s excavations financially since 2005, and although not the sole contributor, Daniel Polisar estimated that in the first
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year alone the project would require an investment of $1.1 million. Roger Hertog, the former part owner of The New York Sun and The New Republic newspapers, and chairman of the Shalem Center, contributed $500,000 in conjunction with his wife Susan to Mazar’s excavations, their support provided in order to show ‘that the Bible reflects Jewish history’. Yet in an interview given by Roger Hertog in 2005, he also explained that, although it ‘was not the most significant reason’, his financial support for Mazar’s work was in part to strengthen Israeli claims to East Jerusalem.

Referring to his patronage of Mazar’s work as ‘venture philanthropy’, Roger Hertog also admitted that no matter what is revealed by the excavations, the finds would be used for political purposes. The fact that articles have appeared in support of Mazar’s conclusions within issues of Azure, Shalem Center’s quarterly journal, The New York Sun and The New Republic highlight the politicization of her results by the Center’s members, with archaeological evidence interpreted in favor of the biblical narrative and in line with the groups core values.

Furthermore the Shalem Centre also currently supports archaeological projects similar in scope to Eilat Mazar’s that deal with issues relating to the Old Testament, with one of the research fellows they finance, Yiftah Shalev, assisting on Mazar’s ‘City of David’ excavations. Another project led by Joshua Schwartz focuses on the geography of Israel during the Second Temple period. Schwartz is also founder of the ‘Jerusalem Reborn Project’ that aims to create a virtual reconstruction of Jerusalem during the First Temple period. Currently consisting of only a digital model of the Second Temple as detailed by Josephus, the ‘Jerusalem Reborn Project’ is one of many similar projects run through UCLA’s Cultural Virtual Reality Laboratory, with work also being conducted upon 9th century BCE stables in Megiddo.
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As the Shalem Center homepage attests, the aim of the organization is to promote Jewish history and Israel as a Jewish nation\textsuperscript{559}. Through both financial and public support of projects, whether journals or archaeological digs, the Shalem Center aims to reinforce the historicity and relevance of the biblical narrative. With long-term projects focused on shaping the future leaders and direction of the country, the Shalem Center’s support of Eilat Mazar’s conclusions should be seen as simply another means for the organization to reinforce and promote its conservative politics. For her part Mazar has remained adamant that King David’s Palace has been found, and as her excavations continue to uncover ever more structures, which she claims reinforces the biblical narrative, so too does she further the Shalem Center’s aim to see a united Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

In addition to their support of archaeological research that reinforces this ideological agenda, the Shalem Center also finances, employs and appropriates scholars from numerous fields including economics, philosophy and political theory. The Shalem Center, through the Adelson Institute for Strategic Studies, is engaged in projects investigating ‘Democracy in the Middle East’, ‘Israel’s relations with the United States’ and the ‘Integration of Arabs into a Jewish State’, further illustrating that archaeology and the work of Eilat Mazar is but one of several means the Center has chosen for the wider dissemination of its political, social and ideological agendas. Above all, however, it must be noted that despite the money and media exposure provided by the Shalem Center to those they sponsor, of over seventy archaeological projects listed on the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs website for 2010\textsuperscript{560} the Center’s support has been accepted by only two excavators, Eilat Mazar\textsuperscript{561} and Joshua Schwartz\textsuperscript{562}.

\textsuperscript{559} The Shalem Center @ www.shalem.org.il/index.php
\textsuperscript{560} www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/History/Early+History+-+Archaeology/
\textsuperscript{561} The Shalem Center @ www.shalem.org.il/Biography-Past/Faculty-Eilat-Mazar.html
\textsuperscript{562} The Shalem Center @ www.shalem.org.il/Biography-Past/Faculty-Joshua-Schwartz.html
6E) The Ir David Foundation: Archaeologists, Settlers and the ‘City of David’.

The Ir David, or ‘City of David’ Foundation\(^\text{563}\), began supporting Jewish settlement in the predominantly Palestinian village of Silwan since 1991\(^\text{564}\), largely through the acquisition of properties and financial support\(^\text{565}\). Also known as Elad (a Hebrew acronym for the phrase ‘to the City of David’), the organization has actively engaged in legal efforts to allow Jewish settlers to inhabit the properties they purchase from Palestinian residents\(^\text{566}\), reportedly owning more then a dozen assets in and around the village of Silwan as of May 10\(^\text{th}\) 2009\(^\text{567}\). In terms of archaeology it was not until 1995 that Elad became actively involved in supporting excavation at the ‘City of David’ site.

Essentially the Ir David Foundation began sponsoring archaeological excavations following the onset of construction for a visitor’s center above the Gihon Spring. Under Israeli law the owners of proposed structures are require to perform excavations prior to the work commencing. When structural remains that archaeologists dated to the Bronze Age were uncovered, the Ir David Foundation continued to fund the work. Ever since, the Foundation has provided millions of dollars to archaeological projects within Jerusalem, often in conjunction with universities, government departments and other private organizations such as the Shalem Center\(^\text{568}\). The Ir David Foundation has run the ‘City of David’ archaeological park since 2002. The project was outsourced to Elad by the Israeli Antiquities Authority (IAA) and the Israel Nature and National Parks Authority (INNPA), and is soon to be in control of the ‘Walls of Jerusalem’ National Park announced in 2005\(^\text{569}\).

\(^{563}\) Bronner 2008, 6.
\(^{564}\) In the 1931 census of Palestine Silwan recorded a population of 2553 Muslims, 124 Jews and 91 Christians. Mills 1932, 43.
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\(^{567}\) Bronner & Kershner, 2009, 1.
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\(^{569}\) Hutman 1991. See also Bronner & Kershner 2009, 1.
Yet considering the sensitivity of both settlement and archaeological issues, the Ir David Foundation has its detractors. While many are representatives of groups politically opposed to Elad’s goals, such as Ir Amin and Peace Now, several have recently drawn media attention to the Ir David Foundation’s biased treatment of material evidence, particularly in a writ issued against Elad in 1994 for ‘knowingly damaging antiquities’.

In an article published in Public Archaeology and written by Raphael Greenberg, an academic from Tel Aviv University who runs a group called Alternative Archaeology, it was further argued that the ‘sanctity of the City of David is newly manufactured’ and that Elad had created at the site a ‘cruel amalgam of history, nationalism and quasi-religious pilgrimage’.

Similarly Professor Benjamin Kedar, chairman of the Israeli Antiquities Authority, described the Ir David Foundation as ‘an association with a pronounced ideological agenda’ that has ‘presented the history of the City of David in a biased manner’. Despite these direct criticisms, albeit in a letter to fellow archaeologists, the IAA continues to work publicly in conjunction with Elad on numerous projects, with the later even subcontracting the IAA to excavate a subterranean tunnel running beneath the site of the ‘City of David’ in February 2009.

In contrast to the opposition of groups such as Ir Amin and Peace Now, who contend that the Ir David Foundation and similar groups only aggravate the tension within the Silwan neighborhood, representatives of the organization have consistently highlighted the financial and cultural benefits provided by its initiatives. Through educational programs and tourism, the Ir David Foundation has seen a steady increase in both domestic and international visitors to the ‘City of David’ archaeological park,
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attracting 400,000 visitors in 2008 alone. Combined with its popular tours of the park, taken by 30,000 people in 2006, the Foundation emphasizes educational programs aimed at encouraging schools to participate in activities structured to highlight the area’s biblical past.

As of December 2006, over 5,000 students have taken part in such programs and coupled with projects like ‘Archaeology for a Day’, also sponsored by Elad, tourism and education are treated as primary mediums for expressing the Foundation’s ideology. The increased interest and the variety of options offered in tours supported by both sides of the political spectrum suggests that the Ir David Foundation is not alone in harnessing tourism to highlight its arguments, with ‘alternative tours’ run by leftwing groups like Ir Amin and Rabbis for Human Rights (RHR) competing with pro-settlement organizations such as the Jerusalem Reclamation Project (Ateret Cohanim) in an ever expanding market.

Tourist dollars and the support of government departments however are not the primary means of finance allowing the Ir David Foundation to function, for the organization is heavily reliant on private donations. Though separate financial entities the US based ‘Friends of Ir David’ provides millions of dollars each year to the Ir David Foundation, with charitable affiliates often named after the group that their fundraising explicitly supports, and these US charities are all required to provide details of their activities to the US government. According to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), 28 organizations gave charitable donations in support of Israeli settlement groups between 2004 and 2007, providing between them a total of $33.4 million in tax-exempt donations.
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According to forms filed by the charity with the IRS, the ‘Friends of Ir David group’ explicitly acknowledges its support for archaeological excavation alongside its pro-settlement aims, having been partly founded in order to ‘teach about the history and archaeology of the biblical city of Jerusalem’\textsuperscript{583}. According to US Form 990s\textsuperscript{584} filed by the Friends of Ir David with the IRS, the charity raised $8.7 million in 2004, $1.2 million in 2005 and a further $2.7 million the following year\textsuperscript{585}. The foundation also reportedly raised $3 million in donations for 2007, with $405,000 contributed by the Irving Moskowitz Foundation alone, while IRS records indicate that $2.5 million was provided to Elad through its New York based affiliate\textsuperscript{586}.

Aside from philanthropist Irving Moskowitz, whose foundation between 1987 and 2001 provided nearly 300 pro-settlement organizations with a total of $55 million in donations\textsuperscript{587}, Russian-American oil billionaire Eugene Shvidler and his wife, Zara, are also noteworthy contributors. Highlighting again the links between finance, archaeology and tourism, the support of all three philanthropists has been immortalized upon a plaque at Elad’s ‘City of David’ visitor center.

6F) Media, Tourism and the Future of Jerusalem’s History.

Having discussed the similarities between Eilat Mazar’s approach to archaeology and that of her patron organizations, it is important to conclude by discussing the wider social context surrounding archaeology in 21\textsuperscript{st} century Israel. Recent media coverage of a proposal aimed at constructing an archaeological tourist park highlights the politicization of archaeology and tourism in Jerusalem\textsuperscript{588}, while also showing that ideologically the aims of the project again mirror those of the Shalem Center, Elad and Eilat Mazar.

\textsuperscript{583} Ignatius 2009, A21.
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Located below the Old City walls and the ‘City of David’ visitor center, this area is important to all three of the world’s monotheistic religions and is referred to as the ‘Holy Basin’. Yet despite government reassurances that a holistic coverage of historical issues will be provided, the opening line of the 2005 proposal indicates it was initiated in order ‘to strengthen the status of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel’. Clearly this statement highlights the ideological motivations behind the park initiative, however, that the Ir David Foundation has been contracted to administer aspects of the project further demonstrates the politicization of the proposal.

According to an interview with Mayor of Jerusalem Nir Barkat published by The Jerusalem Post when asked whether Elad or other right wing organizations would be involved in the project his response was unequivocal; ‘Absolutely not. Not in the conception, not in the process, not even as subcontractors’. Yet this statement contradicts reports suggesting the Ir David Foundation has been subcontracted to manage the project by the government via the Israel Nature and National Parks Authority. Land owned by Elad will be included in the park in a similar arrangement to that already in place for the ‘City of David’, however, it has also been suggested that management of the tourist attraction will be outsourced in a similar manner.

In an interview given to Al-Arabyia by Sarah Kreimer of the Ir Amin advocacy group, it was argued that not only had Elad won the contract to manage the proposed park’s development, but that the normal bidding process allowing other companies to compete for the tender was not upheld. The New York Times has raised separate concerns regarding INNPA neutrality when Osnat Eitan, spokeswoman for the department, was unable to explain how some sites under her department’s purview had come to be contracted to Elad. The fact that the parks authority official responsible for the Jerusalem district, Eviatar Cohen, is a former employee of the Ir David Foundation suggests the INNPA supports Elad’s participation, with Ms. Eitan’s stressing that her
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department cooperated with bodies on the basis of how they could advance the parks authority's goals.\(^{594}\)

Since arguments have already been made by both sides of the Israeli/Palestinian political divide that the intention of the park project is to emphasize Jewish heritage in order to strengthen Israeli claims to annexed East Jerusalem\(^{595}\), participation in the endeavor by Elad only supports claims of an ideological agenda. Tellingly Elad’s website already highlights Jewish graves and archaeological sites across the ‘Holy Basin’\(^{596}\) providing an indication of the size and scope of the development, while tourist booklets published by the IAA over a decade ago also present plans for an archaeological park that suggests such a proposal has been under consideration for many years\(^{597}\).

**Conclusions**

Archaeology in the Middle East has an impact upon the politics of the entire region, of this there are numerous examples, however, the historical credibility of King David, his capital in Jerusalem and the United Monarchy are topics that carry far greater weight.\(^{598}\) Although the Shalem Center and the Ir David Foundation represent two organizations intent on proving the historicity of the biblical narrative, thereby strengthening Jewish sovereignty within the region and furthering claims to East Jerusalem, they are certainly not alone in this endeavor.

For instance a group called Foundation Stone have recently begun financing excavations conducted by Yosef Garfinkel of Hebrew University, for in accordance with the organization’s aim to link ‘traditional texts to the artifacts, maps and locations that form the context for Jewish identity’, Garfinkel’s claim to have uncovered a 10\(^{th}\) century BCE fortress supports the group’s goals. According to director David Willner, the aim of
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Foundation Stone is 'to strengthen the tie of the Jewish people to the land', an ambition that parallels that of the Ir David Foundation, while their patronage of Garfinkel’s excavations mirrors Eilat Mazar’s relationship with Roger Hertog and the Shalem Center.

Hence archaeology can impact upon politics in Israel significantly, a point emphasized by reports from the Camp David summit in 2000 that claimed debates over archaeology, particularly relating to the Haram al-Sharif, were a major cause for a dispute that saw talks break down between Israeli and Palestinian negotiators. That a decade later this argument rages ever stronger suggests that the politicization of archaeology in the Middle East by academics, writers, politicians and the media on both sides of the divide will continue until a solution to the wider territorial dispute is resolved.

---
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Conclusion

Having examined the results of Eilat Mazar’s excavations and compared her finds with those of previous excavators it becomes immediately clear that extra biblical evidence to support the historicity of King David is limited. Archaeological remains from Jerusalem show sparse settlement during the period traditionally attributed to David’s reign (1010-970 BCE), with the population during this period limited by the continued use of fortifications from the Middle Bronze Age. Eilat Mazar’s attribution of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ to the 10th century and her identification of the building as King David’s Palace is not supported by archaeological evidence, however, the fact that Mazar, her sponsors and numerous media sources continue to argue in favor of this inaccurate and misleading hypothesis is cause for concern.

From an archaeological perspective, as no remains let alone sherds from the 10th century BCE were associated with the sections of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ Mazar interprets as King David’s Palace, her reliance upon the ‘brown earth accumulation’ beneath it to date the structure is inherently flawed, as this strata likely represents a fill and therefore represents a secondary rather than primary context. Since the only sherds found in relation to the ‘Large Stone Structure’ were deemed indicative of 9th century BCE deposits, archaeologically it is to the Iron IIB that the walls excavated by Mazar should be dated, for as of publication these are the latest finds associated with the walls of her proposed palace.

In fact Mazar’s excavations provide further support for arguments against the historicity of the biblical narrative, since no evidence of either King David’s Palace or the ‘Fortress of Zion’ David conquered were convincingly documented. Scholarship since the 1960s has shown that sites including Lachish, Megiddo, Samaria and Jerusalem were all inaccurately dated based on information taken from the Old Testament, while extra biblical evidence for a state founded by a man named David is limited to finds produced by the enemies of David’s descendants. Only in the Tel Dan Inscription and the Mesha Stele can proof of a King David’s existence be found outside of the biblical narrative, and
while neither directly references his achievements as described in the Deuteronomistic History, both inscriptions have been interpreted as referring to a political dynasty known to its neighbors as the ‘House of David’.

As a result of this shift in opinion away from accepting the biblical narrative as historically accurate, archaeology in Israel and across the Near East has provided information that helps date when the stories of King David were compiled, as well as illustrating the fact that the compilers of this text borrowed heavily from the traditions and achievements of surrounding kingdoms. Many of David’s most famous achievements were arguably retellings of successful campaigns waged by Israel, or the ‘House of Omri’ as it was known by the Assyrians, while the slaying of Goliath by Eurtha further highlights the regularity of duplication within the Old Testament.

Considering the lack of finds linking the structures Eilat Mazar has excavated to King David, other factors separate from archaeological results and excavations have been deemed equal in importance to the material evidence in forming Mazar’s conclusions, foremost among them her belief in the historicity of the biblical narrative. For instance Mazar’s pre-excavation hypothesis was largely based upon the presence of the Proto-Aeolic capital at the base of the ‘City of David’ ridge, and a single passage from the Book of Samuel (1 Samuel 5: 17). Since the Proto- Aeolic capital has been shown to resemble other examples dating to the 9th century BCE, Mazar’s argument remains founded upon a text that archaeology has shown does not accurately depict the history of the region. That Mazar uses 1 Samuel 5:17’s reference to the as yet unexcavated ‘Fortress of Zion’ to argue in support of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ being King David’s Palace should also be ignored, for until the ‘Fortress of Zion’ is excavated it cannot be used as a point of orientation.

Apart from her continued belief in the historicity of the biblical narrative, this study has also shown that the aims and ideologies of her patrons have influenced the conclusions Eilat Mazar has chosen to publish. Despite the archaeological evidence suggesting a later attribution for the ‘Large Stone Structure’, Mazar continues to interpret
the walls uncovered in accordance with her own ideals and those of her sponsors, with both the Shalem Center and the Ir David Foundation individually intent on reinforcing Jewish roots in East Jerusalem. Since the wider implications of Mazar’s work in terms of greater territorial ambitions and the modern sovereignty of Jerusalem are considerable, the social context within which her conclusions were made becomes incredibly important, for the impact of these factors on her results appear critical.

For example, the Shalem Center’s mission to reassert Israel’s connection to the land whilst reinforcing right wing Zionist values has seen the Center appropriate scholars from several fields in addition to their patronage of Eilat Mazar’s campaigns. Including economics, philosophy and political theory, the Shalem Center’s financial support of archaeologists is but one means the Center employs for the wider dissemination of its political, social and ideological agendas, with only the excavations of Eilat Mazar and Joshua Schwartz currently funded by the Shalem Center. Tellingly it was not until a presentation given by Eilat Mazar to senior members of the Shalem Center in 2005 that funding for her project became available, while since her association with the Center began her public profile, as well as the media attention her discoveries attract, has increased significantly.

The support offered by the Shalem Center to scholars like Mazar, however, goes beyond simply the financial, for through such publications as Azure, Shalem’s English language journal, ‘op-ed’ pieces written by senior members of the Center as well as favorable international media coverage, Mazar’s conclusions have been presented in the popular press as tried, tested and confirmed. That dissenting arguments, opinions and interpretations of Mazar’s preliminary results are often omitted from articles discussing her excavations further highlights the impact, as well as dangers, associated with biased journalism. As Mazar’s excavations are ongoing, her interpretations are based on preliminary data and not that of a complete campaign. This is frequently overlooked or ignored by Mazar personally, her sponsors, publishers and the journalists covering the issue, for all seek sensationalist headlines over substantive, supporting facts.
The Ir David Foundation also contributes financially to archaeological work that strengthens Jewish claims to East Jerusalem. Apart from owning the land upon which Eilat Mazar’s campaigns have been thus far conducted, the Ir David Foundation also operates the ‘City of David’ archaeological park, a prime means of promoting Mazar’s conclusions as well as its own ideological and political agendas. As a pro-settlement organization the Ir David Foundation is primarily focused on the purchasing of property within the predominantly Palestinian village of Silwan, however, tourism and education also play a major role in furthering the Foundation’s goals.

Eilat Mazar’s work forms the basis for many of the guided tours, educational publications and tourist brochures provided to visitors of the site. While dissenting archaeological arguments are omitted from these sources, Mazar’s conclusions adhere to the ideology promoted by the Ir David Foundation and are henceforth endorsed. Just as the Shalem Center promotes Mazar’s conclusions in the Israeli and international media, the Ir David Foundation presents her interpretations as historical fact through plaques, multimedia presentations and tourist maps, each reinforcing the belief in the historicity of the Bible through a distortion of the physical, archaeological evidence.

It therefore must be concluded that Eilat Mazar’s need to prove the historicity of the biblical narrative, coupled with the desire of her financiers for her to reach similar conclusions, has led to the recent persistence in identifying the ‘Large Stone Structure’ as King David’s Palace despite evidence to the contrary as discussed in the previous chapters. The layout and design of the walls and rooms Mazar attributes to this building do not resemble layout, design and level of technical sophistication of previously excavated palaces from either Samaria or Megiddo. In addition, the lack of pottery sherds, debris layers and material evidence indicative of palatial architecture during the Iron Age, particularly the absence of ashlar masonry atop the ridge and assigned to the ‘Large Stone Structure’, again suggests Mazar’s interpretations are incorrect at worst and premature at best.
Apart from remains identified by Steiner from Kenyon’s excavations and sherds recovered by Shiloh and dated by Cahill, very little material evidence from the ‘City of David’ can be attributed to the proposed, traditional time of King David’s reign (1010-970 BCE), suggesting that if a palace once stood upon the site, there now remains no material proof to support its existence. Although the biblical narrative provides important insights into the history of the Jewish people, archaeology has shown that its historicity is unreliable, hence rather then uncovering a palace as described in the Deuteronomistic History, Eilat Mazar has revealed walls, floors and deposits that remain open to interpretation.

Having compiled the evidence and conclusions of past excavations alongside Eilat Mazar’s own ongoing campaign at the ‘City of David’ site this work has attempted to highlight the disparities between not only previous archaeological results relating to the ‘Large Stone Structure’, but also the often overlooked media coverage of Mazar’s discoveries. Through placing emphasis not only upon the academic writings relating to the site but also the texts commonly available to the wider public (newspaper articles, radio interviews and even tourist maps/ brochures), this thesis has endeavored to provide a unique and holistic analysis of the discourse surrounding Eilat Mazar’s excavations.

As a result, despite supportive public statements from her primary benefactors, the Shalem Centre and the Ir David Foundation, as well as dozens of favorable articles confirming Eilat Mazar’s conclusions, currently no indication that King David lived in or conquered Jerusalem as described in the biblical narrative has been revealed through over a century of excavation. Yet considering the recent extra biblical references that have come to prominence in the past two decades, namely the Tel Dan Inscription and the Mesha Stele, there is certainly no denying the possibility that future campaigns will not meet with more success.
Figure 1: Plan of Kenyon’s Excavations. (Steiner, M. L. 2001, 2. Fig. 1.1).
Figure 2: Excavation Areas in the City of David, 1978-82. (Shiloh, Y. 1984, 39. Fig. 2).
Figure 3: A plan of the remains of the Large Stone Structure of the Iron Age IIA at the end of the 2006 season. (Mazar, E. 2009, 64. Fig. Unlisted).
Figure 4: Main sites connected with the conquest narratives. (Finkelstein, I. & Silberman, N. A. 2002, 74. Fig. 9).
Figure 5: Geographical zones of the Land of Israel. (Finkelstein, I. & Silberman, N. A. 2002, 17. Fig. 2).
Figure 6: Iron Age I sites in the central highlands. (Finkelstein, I. & Silberman, N. A. 2002, 116. Fig. 15).
Figure 7: Main places and peoples in Canaan mentioned in the Patriarchal narratives. (Finkelstein, I. & Silberman, N. A. 2002, 32. Fig. 5).
Figure 8: A plan and section of the double cistern as documented by the Macalister and Duncan expedition. (Duncan and Macalister 1926, Fig. 80).
Figure 9: Alternative interpretation of the ‘Large Stone Structure’ and other remains. (Finkelstein, I, Herzog, Z. Singer- Avitz, L. & Ussishkin, D. 2007, 158. Fig. 5).
Figure 10: Tel Dan, Area A. Threshold of gate with door sockets and pivots in situ. (Biran, A. 1996, 7. Fig. 6).

Figure 11: Tel Dan. Area A, Aramaic stele. On right: stele fragment found in the past; on left: two stele fragments found this season. (Biran, A. 1997, 14. Fig. 14).
Abbreviations.

AASOR- Annual of the American School of Oriental Research
AB- Anchor Bible
AJA- American Journal of Archaeology
AJT- Asia Journal of Theology
APEF- Annual of the Palestinian Exploration Fund
Arch- Archaeology
ASCSA- American School of Classical Studies at Athens
ASOR- American School of Oriental Research
BA- Biblical Archaeologist
BAR- Biblical Archaeological Review
BASOR- Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
Bib- Biblica
BN- Biblische Notizen
CAH- Cambridge Ancient History
CBQ- Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CHJ- Cambridge History of Judaism
ErIsr- Eretz- Israel
IAA- Israeli Antiquities Authority
ICPTM- Israeli Committee for the Prevention of the Destruction of Antiquities on the Temple Mount
IEJ- Israel Exploration Journal
IES- Israeli Exploration Society
INNPA- Israel Nature and National Parks Authority
ITN- Independent Television News
JAOS- Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL- Journal of Biblical Literature
JMA- Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology
JNES- Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JNSL- Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages
JPOS- Journal of Palestine Oriental Society
JQR- Jewish Quarterly Review
JSOT- Journal of the Study of the Old Testament
JSS- Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS- Journal of Theological Studies
NEA- Near Eastern Archaeology
OJA- Oxford Journal of Archaeology
PEF- Palestinian Exploration Fund
PEQ- Palestine Exploration Quarterly
Qad- Qadmoniot
RB- Review Biblique
RHR- Rabbis for Human Rights
SHCANE- Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East
SJOT- Scadinavian Journal of the Old Testament
VT- Vetus Testamentum
ZAH- Zeitschrift fur Althebräistik
ZDPV- Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina- Vereins
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