

SCROLL & STONE - IDEAS FOR TEACHERS TO BUILD ON

How archaeology argues

A starting point for teachers to adapt to their own classes - a KS3/GCSE expert-jigsaw lesson on source roles in archaeology.

scrollandstone.org

11 August 2026

How archaeology argues

Teacher pack - KS3 reduced route and GCSE fuller route

Suggested core lesson: 60 minutes. **Optional extension:** 20 minutes.

A starting point for teachers to adapt to their own classes. The cards, routes and timings below are ideas to build on, not a fixed script - map either route to your own scheme of work.

Purpose

Archaeology does not turn an object into a complete answer. It helps us make bounded claims from material records, ancient claims and modern interpretations. Pupils practise naming which layer they are using, matching it to an appropriate source and stating a real limit.

The pack uses three cases: the Merneptah Stele, Assyrian royal representations of Lachish, and the Ketef Hinnom plaques. They are not asked to prove a complete history, a sacred text's composition, or a present-day political claim.

Learning objective and success criterion

Pupils will distinguish three source roles:

- **[M] Material/catalogue report** - what a source records about an object's material, date, findspot, holding or description.
- **[A] Ancient source purpose or claim** - what an ancient maker represented or sought to communicate. This is not automatically a neutral account.
- **[I] Modern interpretation** - a conclusion made by a museum, scholar or pupil from the available evidence.

A secure response identifies at least one role, connects it to a card and gives one proportionate limit. A strong response compares source roles and distinguishes independent corroboration from repeated royal representation.

Curriculum positioning

This pack can support KS3 History, GCSE History source work, GCSE Religious Studies and interdisciplinary humanities. It is not tied to an examination board, curriculum-certified or equally suited to every class. Teachers must map either route to their local scheme of work and assessment language.

Core vocabulary

Teach these five first: **claim, source, provenance, interpretation, uncertainty**. Add the following when useful:

Term	Pupil-friendly meaning
provenance	The documented route from findspot to collection, including what is known and unknown.
material/catalogue report	A modern record of an object's material, date, findspot, description or holding.
ancient purpose or claim	What an ancient maker presented to an audience. It may be interested or selective.
modern interpretation	A later explanation built from material records, ancient claims and reasoning.
corroboration	Independent evidence that supports part of a claim. Repeated messages from one royal power can support that power's representation, but are not independent corroboration of the whole event.
uncertainty	What the available evidence does not settle. Naming it is accuracy.

Materials and non-pupil links

- One **student worksheet** per pupil or pair.
- One cut set of **Cards 1-6** for each expert group. Card 7 is not part of the core lesson.
- One **answer key** for the teacher.
- The three local site pages below are **teacher orientation only - not pupil sources and not part of the evidence set**. Do not send pupils to them or copy their text, images, sacred wording or inscriptional material into this pack without separate source and rights review:
 - [The Merneptah Stele](#)
 - [Assyria: Room 10b](#)
 - [The Ketef Hinnom Amulets](#)

Suggested 60-minute GCSE fuller route

Use the finite expert-jigsaw protocol below. It uses **six core cards only**.

Minute	Teacher action	Pupil output
0-5	Display: An old object proves a story is true . Ask for a qualified response.	Opening reason.
5-12	Model one [M], one [A] and one [I] sentence using the labels, not colours. Explain that a catalogue sentence is a modern report, not the object speaking.	Quick sort and five core terms.
12-17	Assign expert bundles. Give Bundle M only Card 1; Bundle L Cards 2-4; Bundle K Cards 5-6. Repeat M-L-K as needed around the room.	Each expert team marks one [M], [A] and [I] item, or writes not supplied where a role is absent.
17-23	Expert teams complete the matching rows for their own case and prepare a 45-second teaching note: source, role, support, limit.	Completed expert note.
23-29	Form new jigsaw groups of three: one M expert, one L expert and one K expert. Each teaches for two minutes. No card rotation is needed.	Every pupil completes all five matching rows from the three reports.
29-32	Individuals check one row with a partner and add a limit.	Five rows checked, or a precise not on this card .
32-42	Evidence hearing: each jigsaw group chooses one claim. Require source, role label, inference and limit.	30-second statement and one challenge question.
42-52	Pupils write the fuller conclusion. Re-state: Cards 2 and 4 are two media from one royal political world.	90-120 words using two cards, provenance, interpretation and uncertainty.
52-60	Exit ticket and collection.	Accurate rewrite plus one research question.

For a class not divisible by three, make one team a pair or appoint one pupil to carry two expert notes. Do not hand every group all cards and call it a jigsaw. Card 7 remains outside this 60-minute route.

KS3 reduced route - suggested 60 minutes

This route has the same bounded-claim objective, but does not promise a universal fit. Use only Cards **1, 2 and 5** - one card per case. Pupils complete matching rows 1, 2 and 4, rehearse an oral evidence hearing and write **60-80 words** or dictate the same response. Use the remaining two claim rows as teacher modelling, not independent written work. Read the three cards aloud where needed; provide the five-term glossary and sentence stems. Adjust the timings above to suit your own class's reading and writing pace.

Teaching notes

Merneptah - a narrow named reference

Card 1 uses Gabrielle Vera Novacek's *Ancient Israel: Highlights from the Collections of the Oriental Institute* (2011), **Oriental Institute Museum Publications 31**, published by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Its printed pp. 67-68 support the publication's dating, naming, people-determinative and Cairo statements. The card's royal-purpose point is labelled [I], not reported fact.

Lachish - record the location discrepancy

Do not conceal a contradiction in the source record. The British Museum's general Assyrian gallery page describes the Lachish display in **Room 10b**. The individual record for the panel used on Card 3, object **W_1856-0909-14_7**, says it is on display in **Room 10a, Section A**. This pack does not decide whether the difference reflects a gallery/object distinction or a display change. Say exactly that to pupils: records can conflict and a responsible researcher logs the conflict, identifies the records and asks the museum to confirm the current arrangement. The linked local page still uses "Room 10b" and is teacher orientation only; it has not been revised for this pack.

Cards 2-4 show repeated Assyrian royal representation in visual and written media. That supports a conclusion about how the court represented the campaign. It is not independent corroboration of the whole event.

Ketef Hinnom - do not invent an excavation method

The Israel Museum exhibition page read for Card 5 supports only a broad statement about jewellery found in a late First Temple-period burial cave at Ketef Hinnom, dated to the seventh-sixth centuries BCE. It does not supply stratigraphy, associated finds, excavation sequence or chain of custody. Card 6 is explicitly an abstract-only scholarly source. Teach general excavation method as general method, not as a claim that these two read records establish it.

Access and response options

- **Large print:** use the unproved 14 pt route noted above; check writable space before use.
- **Oral route:** permit reading aloud, scribing, speech-to-text or recorded oral responses against the same source-role-and-limit criterion.
- **EAL route:** supply the five core definitions in plain English, rehearse pronunciation and permit the worksheet stems.
- **Stretch:** ask pupils what new source would be genuinely independent of Assyrian royal representation.

No pupil should be asked to speak for Jews, Israelis, Palestinians, Egyptians, Assyrians or another group. Keep the lesson on evidence and historical method, not present-day politics.

Optional extension - Card 7 only

Card 7 is an optional, teacher-led 20-minute extension. It is not printed, allocated, assessed or needed in the 60-minute core. The linked journal page offers restricted full-text access. This pack uses the **abstract only**, so pupils may discuss why an abstract permits a conditional conclusion but

may not treat it as a full reading of the article. A teacher without access can still use the card because the limited abstract is the stated evidence base; do not add claims from the inaccessible full text.

Give Card 7 to the whole class after the core exit ticket. Pupils label its abstract-based report [M] and its conditional conclusion [I], then write one sentence beginning **This abstract permits the conditional claim that ...** and one beginning **It cannot settle ...**. Do not reproduce or transcribe the underlying inscription.

Teacher source ledger - review-cited records; selected direct rechecks 2026-08-11

Card	Record and locator	Access/status	Bounded use in this pack
1	Gabrielle Vera Novacek, <i>Ancient Israel: Highlights from the Collections of the Oriental Institute</i> (2011), Oriental Institute Museum Publications 31, printed pp. 67-68. https://oi.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/shared/docs/oimp31.pdf	Public PDF; rights notice says no reproduction without permission.	Date, earliest non-biblical reference, people determinative and Cairo only.
2	British Museum, Assyria gallery page. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/galleries/assyria-lion-hunts	Public web page; availability must be rechecked.	Gallery's Lachish and Room 10b description.
3	British Museum, object W_1856-0909-14_7. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/W_1856-0909-14_7	Public web record; availability and display location must be rechecked with the museum.	Panel material, date range, subject, palace provenance and Room 10a record.
4	British Museum, Taylor Prism, W_1855-1003-1. https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/W_1855-1003-1	Public web record; availability must be rechecked.	Object type/date, findspot field and catalogue's royal-inscription description.
5	Israel Museum, Jerusalem, <i>Silver and gold jewelry</i> . https://www.imj.org.il/en/exhibitions/silver-and-gold-jewelry	Public exhibition page.	Broad burial-cave and seventh-sixth-century BCE statement only.
6	Barkay, Lundberg, Vaughn and Zuckerman, <i>The Amulets from Ketef Hinnom: A New Edition and Evaluation</i> (2004), abstract. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.2307/4150106	Restricted full text; abstract read.	1979, high-resolution images, late pre-exilic context and amulet classification only.
7	Ehud Ben Zvi (1994), restricted-access Tel Dan article, abstract. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/030908929401906403	Restricted full text; abstract read.	Optional conditional-reading discussion only.

Citation is not reuse permission. Do not scan, screenshot, photocopy, upload or copy pages from the UChicago PDF, museum imagery or restricted journal content. The pupil materials contain no museum image, PDF page, sacred wording or inscription transcription.

Assessment prompt

Credit a response that: (1) names a card, (2) marks the source role, (3) gives a bounded conclusion and (4) states a real limit. Do not credit a conclusion merely because it is confident. Do not require a pupil to use every card.

How archaeology argues - student worksheet

A starting point for teachers to adapt to their own classes.

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____

The rule of the lesson

Scroll & Stone uses two registers.

- **Scroll** is a community's tradition, story, text or memory. It can matter deeply without pretending to be a laboratory report.
- **Stone** is a dated, sourced, checkable record: an object, inscription, document, place, measurement or report.

Stone is evidence, not automatic neutrality. Ask who made it, why, where it was found and what it cannot tell us.

1. Three source roles - no colours needed

Write the label in square brackets. These labels work in black and white.

- **[M]** = material/catalogue report - a modern record of an object, date, description, findspot or holding.
- **[A]** = ancient source purpose or claim - what an ancient maker presented to an audience.
- **[I]** = modern interpretation - a conclusion made from evidence and reasoning.
- **[Q]** = question or missing information.

If a card does not supply one of the roles, write **[Q] not supplied**. Do not invent it.

1. A museum catalogue dates a clay prism to 691 BCE. _____
 2. The prism proves that every part of one historical account happened exactly as later told. _____
 3. Who commissioned the inscription and what did they want an audience to think? _____
 4. A museum exhibition page reports jewellery from a burial cave at Ketef Hinnom. _____
-

2. Five useful words

1. The documented route from a findspot to a collection is its _____.
2. A conclusion built from evidence and reasoning is an _____.
3. Evidence from a genuinely separate source that supports part of a claim is _____.

4. What the evidence does not settle is _____.
5. A statement that can be checked against evidence is a _____.

3. Your fixed expert-jigsaw task

Your teacher will give your first team one bundle:

- **M bundle:** Card 1
- **L bundle:** Cards 2, 3 and 4
- **K bundle:** Cards 5 and 6

First, become an expert on your bundle. Then move into a jigsaw group with one M expert, one L expert and one K expert. Each expert has two minutes to teach the others: one source report, one ancient purpose or claim, one modern interpretation or **not supplied**, and one limit. Card 7 is not part of this task.

Claim-source match

GCSE fuller route: complete all five rows.

KS3 reduced route: complete rows 1, 2 and 4. Your teacher models the other two.

Claim	Best card(s)	Which role is most useful: [M], [A] or [I]?	What does it support?	What does it not settle?
1. An Egyptian source uses the name Israel around 1208/1207 BCE and marks it as a people rather than a city.				
2. The Assyrian court represented the capture of Lachish in images.				
3. An Assyrian royal inscription describes tribute from Hezekiah of Judah in connection with 701 BCE.				
4. The Ketef Hinnom material has a broad late First Temple-period, seventh-sixth-century BCE context on the museum page.				
5. A scholarly abstract reports later imaging and a rereading of two silver plaques.				

4. Put one argument together

Choose one case. Circle it: **Merneptah** / **Lachish** / **Ketef Hinnom**

A. Source route

1. [M] What does a modern record report about material, date, place, finding or holding?

2. [A] What did the ancient maker claim or try to communicate? If the card does not say, write [Q] not supplied.

3. [I] What bounded interpretation can a modern reader make?

B. Responsible uncertainty

- This evidence **supports / suggests / is consistent with** _____
because _____.
- It does **not by itself show** _____
because _____.

5. Evidence hearing

Prepare a 30-second statement. Say the labels aloud.

Our claim is _____. Card _____ gives the [M/A/I] source role of _____. From this we interpret _____.
However, it cannot settle _____.

Ask another group:

Is that independent corroboration, or repeated representation from the same political power?

Their answer: _____

6. Final judgement

GCSE fuller route: write 90-120 words using at least two cards and the words **provenance**, **interpretation** and **uncertainty**.

KS3 reduced route: write or dictate 60-80 words using at least one card, one role label and one limit.

How far can archaeology help us argue about the past?

Exit ticket

Rewrite this claim so it is accurate:

An old object proves a story is true.

One question I would still investigate:

How archaeology argues - source cards

A starting point for teachers to adapt to their own classes.

Core cut instruction: Print and cut Cards **1-6** only. Allocate them through the fixed M-L-K expert-jigsaw route in the teacher guide. These are paraphrased source notes, not copied source text. They contain no museum images, PDF pages, sacred wording or inscription transcriptions.

Role key: **[M]** material/catalogue report; **[A]** ancient source purpose or claim; **[I]** modern interpretation. A card may say a role is not supplied by the read record. That is a finding, not a gap for pupils to invent.

Card 1 - Merneptah Stele: a narrow named reference

Evidence type: Egyptian royal victory inscription

Source: Gabrielle Vera Novacek, *Ancient Israel: Highlights from the Collections of the Oriental Institute* (2011), *Oriental Institute Museum Publications* 31, printed pp. 67-68.

Teacher source URL: <https://oi.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/shared/docs/oimp31.pdf>

[M] Material/catalogue report

The University of Chicago publication dates the Merneptah victory stele to 1208/1207 BCE. It describes it as the earliest non-biblical written reference to a people called Israel, says the signs classify Israel as a people rather than a city, and records that the original is in Cairo.

[A] Ancient source purpose or claim

It is an Egyptian royal victory inscription. Its ancient maker presented a campaign in a victory monument.

[I] Modern interpretation

The publication's date and sign classification support the bounded conclusion that an Egyptian royal source used the name Israel for a people at that date. A victory monument's purpose matters when interpreting it; this does not turn the source into a census or a complete social history.

Limit: The card does not settle the group's size, precise location, origins, language, political structure or every later history connected with the name.

Ask: Which sentence is a modern report [M], which describes an ancient claim [A], and which is an interpretation [I]?

Card 2 - Lachish reliefs: a gallery record and a conflict to log

Evidence type: palace reliefs and gallery description

Source: British Museum, Assyria gallery page.

Teacher source URL: <https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/galleries/assyria-lion-hunts>

[M] Material/catalogue report

The British Museum gallery page describes a Lachish-siege display in **Room 10b**, identifies Lachish as a chief city of the kingdom of Judah and says Sennacherib captured it in 701 BCE. The page is a general gallery record, not the individual panel record.

[A] Ancient source purpose or claim

The reliefs were made in an Assyrian royal setting to present a campaign visually. They are ancient royal representation, not an eyewitness account from every side.

[I] Modern interpretation

The gallery description and the image programme support an interpretation that the Assyrian court publicly represented the capture as a royal victory. The claim about palace provenance belongs to Card 3's individual record, not this gallery page.

Location discrepancy to log: The gallery page calls the Lachish display Room 10b. Card 3's individual object record says that panel is on display in Room 10a, Section A. This pack does not resolve the conflict; record both labels and seek museum confirmation before a teaching cycle.

Limit: The gallery page and reliefs do not give every detail of the battle, the experience of inhabitants, numbers involved or a Judaeian account.

Ask: What would you write in a source log instead of silently choosing one room number?

Card 3 - One Lachish panel: individual object record

Evidence type: individual museum object record

Source: British Museum, object W_1856-0909-14_7.

Teacher source URL: https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/W_1856-0909-14_7

[M] Material/catalogue report

The individual record describes a gypsum wall-panel relief in low relief, gives a production range of 700-692 BCE, identifies Sennacherib watching the capture of Lachish and lists scholarly catalogue references. It attaches this panel's ancient palace provenance to Sennacherib's South-West Palace at Nineveh. The same record currently gives its display location as **Room 10a, Section A**.

[A] Ancient source purpose or claim

The panel presents the king watching a capture. It is a royal image made within a palace context.

[I] Modern interpretation

An individual object record is the right place to check this panel's material description, collection identity and stated palace provenance. It supports analysis of royal representation, not a complete reconstruction of the siege.

Limit: A collection record documents the museum's object information. It does not independently establish every event pictured or provide excavated evidence from Lachish itself.

Ask: Why should an argument about this panel name its object number?

Card 4 - Taylor Prism: a written royal record

Evidence type: inscribed clay prism and collection record

Source: British Museum, Taylor Prism, museum number 91032.

Teacher source URL: https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/W_1855-1003-1

[M] Material/catalogue report

The British Museum identifies the Taylor Prism as a hexagonal clay prism dated to 691 BCE. Its record gives Nebi Yunus as the findspot and describes an inscription listing Sennacherib's campaigns, including tribute from Hezekiah of Judah in connection with 701 BCE.

[A] Ancient source purpose or claim

The inscription is an Assyrian royal account of campaigns and tribute. It tells pupils what the court chose to put into a royal record.

[I] Modern interpretation

Alongside the reliefs, the prism supports a conclusion about Assyrian royal representation in more than one medium. It is **not** independent corroboration of the whole event: both sources come from the same royal political world. They can corroborate that the court repeated its representation.

Limit: The prism cannot by itself show that every royal claim is complete, how the other side described events or why details may be absent.

Ask: What would count as a more independent source for an event than another Assyrian royal record?

Card 5 - Ketef Hinnom: a broad exhibition statement

Evidence type: museum exhibition page

Source: Israel Museum, Jerusalem, *Silver and gold jewelry*.

Teacher source URL: <https://www.imj.org.il/en/exhibitions/silver-and-gold-jewelry>

[M] Material/catalogue report

The Israel Museum exhibition page describes silver and gold jewellery found in a burial cave at Ketef Hinnom. It calls the material late First Temple-period and gives a seventh-sixth-century BCE range.

[A] Ancient source purpose or claim

The short exhibition page does not provide an ancient maker's claim or an excavation record. Write not supplied by this page rather than inventing one.

[I] Modern interpretation

This is a broad modern museum context statement. It can support a cautious claim about the page's stated burial-cave context and date range. It does **not** establish a stratigraphic sequence, associated finds, excavation method or chain of custody.

Limit: Ask for an excavation publication before making a more exact contextual or method claim. General archaeological principles are not proof that this page reports those details.

Ask: What extra record would you request before teaching how the excavation dated a specific object?

Card 6 - Ketef Hinnom: rereading in an abstract-only article

Evidence type: scholarly article abstract - full text restricted

Source: Barkay, Lundberg, Vaughn and Zuckerman, *The Amulets from Ketef Hinnom: A New Edition and Evaluation* (2004), abstract only.

Teacher source URL: <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.2307/4150106>

[M] Material/catalogue report

The article abstract reports a rereading of two silver plaques found at Ketef Hinnom in 1979. It says detailed high-resolution images identified or clarified previously difficult letters.

[A] Ancient source purpose or claim

This card does not reproduce, translate or classify the ancient wording. The abstract does not let pupils infer the full purpose or beliefs of every ancient user.

[I] Modern interpretation

The authors reaffirm a late pre-exilic chronological context and classify the plaques as protective amulets. That is a modern scholarly argument reported in an **abstract-only** source, not an unchanging answer supplied by the objects alone.

Limit: The abstract does not settle the composition date of a larger sacred text, exact authorship, universal practice or every detail of the excavation. Do not add claims from the restricted full text unless it is separately read and reviewed.

Ask: Why is the authors reaffirm more accurate than the object proves forever ?

Card 7 - Optional extension only: a conditional scholarly reading

Not for the 60-minute core. Use only as the teacher-led optional extension.

Evidence type: scholarly article abstract - full text restricted

Source: Ehud Ben Zvi (1994), restricted-access article on a Tel Dan reading, abstract only.

Teacher source URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/030908929401906403>

[M] Material/catalogue report

The accessible abstract concerns a proposed reading of letters on an Aramaic stele from Tel Dan. The full article is restricted.

[A] Ancient source purpose or claim

The abstract does not provide enough context to teach the stele's original purpose. Do not fill this gap with a transcription or a claim from an unread full text.

[I] Modern interpretation

The abstract says one proposed reading is possible but alternatives remain, and recommends caution. It models a conditional conclusion from an abstract, not a final judgement from a full article.

Limit: This card cannot decide the preferred reading or stand in for the full research article.

Ask: How can scholars disagree responsibly without concluding that anything goes?

How archaeology argues - answer key

Teacher key. Accept well-reasoned alternatives that remain within the cards' stated source role and limit.

Role labels: [M] material/catalogue report, [A] ancient source purpose or claim, [I] modern interpretation, [Q] question or missing information. A modern catalogue sentence is [M]; it is not the object speaking without mediation.

1. Three source roles

1. [M] - a modern catalogue report.
 2. [I] - and it is an overlarge interpretation.
 3. [Q] - the purpose needs evidence.
 4. [M] - a modern exhibition report of a find context.
-

2. Five useful words

1. provenance
 2. interpretation
 3. corroboration
 4. uncertainty
 5. claim
-

3. Claim-source match

Claim	Best card(s)	Best role and bounded support	What remains outside the cards
Egyptian source names Israel around 1208/1207 BCE and classifies it as a people.	1	[M] The Chicago publication reports date and classification; [I] a bounded conclusion follows.	Origins, size, location and complete history.
Assyrian court represented Lachish in images.	2, with 3 for the particular panel	[A] royal image programme; [M] gallery and object record.	Every event detail or inhabitants' experience.
Assyrian royal inscription describes tribute in connection with 701 BCE.	4	[M] catalogue report of inscription content; [A] royal claim.	Completeness, neutrality and another side's view.
Ketef Hinnom material has the broad museum date/context.	5, supplemented by 6	[M] museum's broad exhibition statement; [I] scholars' abstract-based argument.	Exact deposit sequence or exact date.
Abstract reports later imaging and a rereading of plaques.	6	[M] report of abstract method; [I] authors' classification/context argument.	Full article evidence, authorship or wider sacred-text history.

Corroboration correction

Cards 2 and 4 are **not independent corroboration of the whole event**. They are visual and written media from the Assyrian royal world. Together they corroborate that the court represented its campaign repeatedly. An excavation report from Lachish or a genuinely separate contemporary source could do a different corroborating job.

4. Model case responses, with source roles

Merneptah Stele

- **[M] Material/catalogue report:** Card 1's University of Chicago publication dates the stele to 1208/1207 BCE, reports the people classification and says the original is in Cairo.
- **[A] Ancient source purpose or claim:** It is an Egyptian royal victory monument presenting a campaign as victory.
- **[I] Modern interpretation:** The publication's reported date and classification support the limited conclusion that an Egyptian royal source used the name Israel for a people at that date.
- **Limit:** This does not narrate a complete social, political or community history.

Responsible conclusion: The card strongly supports a narrow named-reference claim. It does not make a complete historical narrative certain.

Lachish reliefs and Taylor Prism

- **[M] Material/catalogue report:** Card 2's gallery record calls the Lachish display Room 10b; Card 3's individual panel record identifies its South-West Palace provenance and currently gives Room

10a, Section A; Card 4's record dates the prism to 691 BCE and describes its tribute entry. The room labels conflict and must be logged, not harmonised without museum confirmation.

- **[A] Ancient source purpose or claim:** The panel and prism present Assyrian royal representation of campaign and tribute in different media.
- **[I] Modern interpretation:** The source set supports the conclusion that the Assyrian court repeated a campaign representation in images and writing. It does not independently establish every detail of the event.
- **Limit:** No card supplies an account from inhabitants of Lachish or a complete reconstruction of the campaign.

Responsible conclusion: The sources are strong evidence of what the Assyrian court represented. They are not a pair of independent accounts from every side.

Ketef Hinnom

- **[M] Material/catalogue report:** Card 5 reports only the Israel Museum's broad burial-cave and seventh-sixth-century BCE statement. Card 6 reports what a restricted article's abstract says about plaques found in 1979 and high-resolution imaging.
- **[A] Ancient source purpose or claim:** The cards do not provide enough material to state a full ancient purpose. A pupil may correctly write **[Q] not supplied**.
- **[I] Modern interpretation:** The authors reported in Card 6 reaffirm a late pre-exilic context and classify the plaques as protective amulets. This is an abstract-based scholarly interpretation.
- **Limit:** Do not call general excavation method a fact established by Card 5. The read exhibition page does not give stratigraphy, associated finds, sequence or chain of custody.

Responsible conclusion: The cards support a broad museum context and an abstract-based scholarly argument. They do not settle wider questions about a sacred text, all ancient practice or an exact date.

5. Evidence-hearing checklist

Award credit where the group does all four:

1. names a source card;
2. labels its role [M], [A], [I] or [Q];
3. makes a conclusion no larger than the card permits;
4. names a genuine limitation.

Useful questions:

- Is that a modern report, an ancient claim or your interpretation?
- What record gives that date, provenance or display information?
- Is the second source independent corroboration, or repeated royal representation?
- What information is not supplied by this card?

6. Indicative final judgements

GCSE fuller route - 90-120 words

Archaeology helps historians argue about the past when they distinguish provenance, interpretation and uncertainty. Card 1's [M] publication report supports a narrow claim about an Egyptian royal source naming Israel as a people around 1208/1207 BCE, but the victory monument does not provide a whole history. Cards 2 and 4 add [A] Assyrian royal representation in image and writing. They show that the court repeated its campaign message, not that two independent sources prove every event. Card 6 also shows why later scholarly interpretation matters: an abstract can report a rereading without settling every question. Good conclusions state what a source supports and what further evidence would be needed.

KS3 reduced route - 60-80 words

Archaeology can help us make careful claims when we check provenance and uncertainty. Card 1 is a [M] modern report that supports a narrow point about a royal inscription naming a people. It does not prove a complete story. Card 2 is evidence of an [A] royal image, so we should ask what its makers wanted viewers to think. Interpretation links the evidence to a conclusion, but it must keep a limit.

7. Exit-ticket answers

Accept answers such as:

- An old object can support a specific claim when its provenance, source role and limits are checked, but it does not prove an entire story.
- An archaeological source may be strong evidence for one point while leaving other questions uncertain.

Do not accept an answer that treats Scroll as false or Stone as infallible.

8. Optional extension - Card 7 only

Accept: The abstract permits a conditional scholarly reading, but says alternatives remain possible.

Reject: The inscription settles the question. Card 7 is abstract-only, teacher-led and outside the core lesson. It models a restricted source's limit, not a full reading or a transcription exercise.